

# QUESTIONS ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

BY

AMBROSIASTER



# QUESTIONS ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

BY

AMBROSIASTER

INTRODUCTION AND EDITING BY JOHN LITTERAL

TRANSLATOR CHOOSES TO REMAIN ANONYMOUS



## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
SCRIPTURE ORDER	5
POLEMIC	310
MISCELLANEOUS	344
INDEX OF QUESTIONS	403



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I want to thank Darren Weeks for volunteering his time to proof read this work, which was very generous and helpful.



## INTRODUCTION

Ambrosiaster was an anonymous fourth century Christian writer who is credited with writing commentaries on all of St. Paul's epistles and a compilation of treatises known as the Questions on the Old and New Testaments. The name Ambrosiaster is not the actual name of the writer, but the name means "Star of Ambrose," and this name was given after the Ambrosian authorship of the commentaries on Paul's epistles had been ruled out, which will be discussed further below. Scholars are still unsure of the author's identity, but they are certain that the same author is responsible for both the commentaries on the epistles and the Questions.

These Questions (*Quaestio*) means 'an enquiry' or investigation into passages of Scripture which are difficult to understand.<sup>1</sup> The Questions on the Old and New Testaments is a compilation of essays of various sizes as well as discourses and sermons. Some of the questions thoroughly examine and explain important doctrinal matters such as the meaning of God, the sin of Adam and Eve, baptism of the Savior, etc. Some questions are treatises against opponents to Christianity and heretics such as Pagans, Arians, Novatian, etc. There are some questions that are running commentaries on the Psalms and Gospels, while others are on Old Testament heroes such as Melchizedek, Abraham, Job, and Tobit.<sup>2</sup>

The Questions by Ambrosiaster are found in two different manuscript traditions. Both manuscript traditions are manifested in this translation and placed in sections or categories, such as, 1<sup>st</sup> Category and 2<sup>nd</sup> Category. The manuscript tradition of the 1<sup>st</sup> Category is a compilation of 127 "Questions" and the MS tradition of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Category is a compilation of 150. "Of these questions, eighty-nine are common to both collections, and almost two thirds of these eighty-nine have undergone some rewriting."<sup>3</sup> The English translation for this book is based upon the text from the collection of Migne (PL 35 2214-2416).

There are a lot of explanations to specific passages of Scripture in the Questions by Ambrosiaster, which means that they are useful for exegetical purposes. The way that the questions are organized in the manuscripts and the printed edition that

this translation is based upon would make it difficult, to say the least, to use it for looking up specific passages to see what Ambrosiaster had to say about them, because the order of the questions in the manuscripts do not follow a consistent pattern nor order that the Scripture passages would be in the Bible. For this reason, I have chosen to provide the questions that concern specific passages of Scripture to follow the order found in the Bible, such as by book, chapter, and verse. For those questions that are polemic in nature, they are placed in a section separate called “Polemic,” and other questions that are not polemic nor exegetical are placed in a section called “Miscellaneous.”

For many years, the Questions on the Old and New Testaments were thought to have been written by Augustine of Hippo and were placed among his works. Scholars have long determined since then that it was not written by Augustine, and was in fact the same author of the Bible commentaries of Paul’s epistles that is mentioned above. There are many examples that demonstrates how scholarly rejection of the Augustinian authorship of the Questions is more than justified, starting with the choice of topics, the method of teaching, the difference of style, which are quite in opposition to the genius and the faith of Augustine. Augustine’s teachings on original sin is an indicator that he was not the author of the Questions, because the author claims without constraint, in Question 13, that the children who died with their parents in the fire of Sodom were “exempt from the punishments of hell, because they have been victims of a crime they did not commit.” Therefore, the author of these questions has appeared here to deny ‘original sin.’ Also, the same author claims, in questions 21 and 45, that ‘woman’ was not created in the image of God, while St. Augustine teaches the contrary in his book on the Literal Meaning of Genesis, Book 3, chapter 22. Another example, in question 41, the author endeavors to prove that these words of Genesis: “The Spirit of God was carried on the waters,” should not be understood of the Holy Spirit, as Augustine, however, explains it in several places.<sup>4</sup>

As mentioned above, scholars are of the opinion, for good reason, that the authorship of the Questions on the Old and New Testaments is the same for the Bible commentaries on the epistles of Paul.<sup>5</sup> Alexander Souter, who devoted nearly 130 pages to this point, demonstrated by comparing these two works and found the greatest similarities between the community of illustrations and allusions,

comparison of Scripture quotations, comparison of style and language, identity of thought such as favorite texts of Scripture and interpretations of Scripture.<sup>6</sup> Scholars think, moreover, that these two works must have been composed at about the same time; the commentaries, under the pontificate of Pope Damasus, who died towards the end of the year 384, as attested by the author of these writings in chapter 3, verse 15 of the second epistle to Timothy, and Question 44 (Against the Jews).<sup>7</sup>

As mentioned above, scholars are uncertain of the identity of the author of the commentaries and the Questions, but I will leave the readers with a quote from Alexander Souter on this point...

“Erasmus, in the year 1527, was the first to suspect the accuracy of this ascription; and thereafter speculation became rife as to the real author. At the dawning of modern scholarship, as it is still more clearly at the present time, Ambrosian authorship was seen to be an impossibility. Some guessed that the work was a cento made from S. Jerome and S. Chrysostom by some unknown person; others believed it to be by Julian of Aeclanum or some other Pelagian; others by Remigius, others by Tyconius, the author of the ‘Rules,’ others by S. Hilary of Poitiers, others by Hilary of Pavia, others by Hilary of Syracuse; very many have attributed the work to Hilarius, a deacon of Rome. The statement of S. Augustine, who undoubtedly meant S. Hilary of Poitiers as the author of the quotation he makes, is responsible for the last four views. S. Hilary of Poitiers is unhesitatingly to be rejected owing to known differences of style. Most of the other names are idle conjectures, carelessly thrown out before the days of exact method in the study of literature and history. Langen himself put forward a view that Faustinus, a Roman presbyter, is the author. His proof, built up chiefly from a comparison of the language of both works with that of the *De Trinitate* and other writings of Faustinus, is so far from being convincing that it certainly shows Faustinian authorship to be impossible. This conjecture has had the fate of the others. Dr Marold and Dom Morin, for example, explicitly reject it. The recent view, that Isaac, a converted Jew, who was concerned in the disturbances at the election of Pope Damasus and afterwards relapsed to Judaism, wrote the commentaries and the *Quaestiones V. et N. Testamenti*, is due to Dom Germain Morin, O.S.B., of the Abbaye, Maredsous, who by his successful researches and independent criticism has shown himself a worthy follower of his Benedictine predecessors. Dr. Zahn and Mr. A. E. Burn, both called for a fuller treatment of

the subject. This I have endeavored to supply, as the special study I had devoted to the language of the commentary seemed to invite me to the task. I can heartily support Dom Morin's second suggestion, that Hilary, the Layman, was the author.”<sup>8</sup>

1 Alexander Souter, A Study of Ambrosiaster, Volume 7, Issue 4 of Texts and studies: Contributions to Biblical and patristic literature, Publisher Kraus Reprint, 1967, Original from the University of Virginia. (pg. 8)

2 See Alexander Souter, A Study of Ambrosiaster, Volume 7, Issue 4 of Texts and studies: Contributions to Biblical and patristic literature, Publisher Kraus Reprint, 1967, Original from the University of Virginia. (pgs. 8-9)

3 Ambrosiaster’s Method of Interpretation in the Questions on the Old and New Testament. Marie-Pierre Bussieres. Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle in Late Antiquity: The Alexandrian Commentary Tradition between Rome and Baghdad, Dr John W Watt, Dr Josef Lössl Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., Jul 28, 2013; (pg. 54)

4 See Patrologiae cursus completes, the Benedictine editors; Volume 35, Jacques-Paul Migne, Apud Garnier Fratres, 1902. (pgs. 2208-09)

5 English translation of the Epistles of Paul by Ambrosiaster: Commentaries on Romans and 1-2 Corinthians; Commentaries on Galatians--Philemon (Ancient Christian Texts) translated and edited by Gerald L. Bray. IVP.

6 Alexander Souter, A Study of Ambrosiaster, Volume 7, Issue 4 of Texts and studies: Contributions to Biblical and patristic literature, Publisher Kraus Reprint, 1967, Original from the University of Virginia. (pgs. 23-152)

7 See Patrologiae cursus completes, the Benedictine editors; Volume 35, Jacques-Paul Migne, Apud Garnier Fratres, 1902. (pgs. 2208-09)

8 See Alexander Souter, A Study of Ambrosiaster, Volume 7, Issue 4 of Texts and studies: Contributions to Biblical and patristic literature, Publisher Kraus Reprint, 1967, Original from the University of Virginia. (pgs. 4-5)

## QUESTIONS ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

### GENESIS

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 106. ON GENESIS.** — "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." If God created heaven and earth in the beginning, and heaven is the firmament, as the sequel shows, it is not true that light was made first place, and then the firmament; for the sacred author could not designate another heaven, because he describes the creation of the world as God made it in its perfection. As men followed erroneous systems of the creation of the world, Moses, inspired by God, teaches them the true origin of the world. Some, in fact, pretended that it had not had a beginning, others that it had had a beginning, but that it had been made by angels; others also maintained that it had been done, but by a certain Sacla, who is the god of opposing power. A small number, in the tradition of truth about the origin of the world, asserted that it had God as his author. It was to undeceive those who were the victims of these false opinions that Moses was compelled to make known the true cause of the world, lest the children of Israel, freed from the tyranny of the Egyptians, should not yet be slaves to their slaves of false interpretations. Indeed, the Egyptians, among all peoples, were zealous advocates of error, for centuries they had applied themselves more than all others to the study of a vain philosophy. Now, Moses, by the very fact that he had been adopted by the. the daughter of Pharaoh, had been instructed in all the science of the Egyptians. (Exod. 2:10; Acts 7:22.) What do these words signify: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth?" If by the truth we must understand what we have said above, let us see what he means. We believe that Moses, in order to destroy all error on the lower creatures and on the matter which has served to make the world, first wanted to speak of the substances and elements which have served to create the world, if had said nothing, one might have thought that these substances were equal and co-eternal to God. He, therefore, who believes in the account of the inspired author, cannot doubt that the world was created, since Moses attests that the

substances that served the creation of the world were created in the beginning. God created heaven and earth in the beginning, that is, the higher and the lower substance. The higher substance was the essential material of the sky, the lower substance is a thicker substance which has served to make the arid element called earth and darkness. That is why it is said in the prophet Isaiah: "I am the God who made light and created darkness (Is. 45:7)." When God created these things, he also titled the material element, that is to say, water, darkness, and earth before the signs of the times; according to some, is a heap of frozen water, it is so called, because it is formed by a mass of water; solidified and firmed by the power of God, and is also given the name of heaven from the verbs *occulendo*, *celanda*, conceal, hide. Water appears first, because it is the principal element, and it has served to form the vault of the world. The earth is like the floor, and David testifies that it is the work of the Holy Spirit: "Let the waters that are above the heavens praise the name of the Lord, for he says, and all things have been done; he commanded, and all was created (Ps. 148:4)." After the creation of these elements, and before the organization of the world, God created light, to spread clarity on his works, and this light, as a result of God's established rule, provides the space of a day. The night succeeded the day, according to the same rule, and after the space of time assigned to it, it was illuminated by the return of the morning light. So the first day ended with the beginning of the second day, for the night was gathered in the day, to do with it only one day, because the darkness being subjected to light have no independent existence and may be numbered. Thirty days form a lunar month and in these thirty days are included nights. The space of time during which the light fills the office assigned to it is called day. The dark element before being lighted is called night, and it is the space of time which is between the end of the day and the rising of the dawn which bears the name of night. For it is not the darkness that makes the night, as the light is made, because the darkness remains what it is by nature. On the contrary, the return of light is born, and its disappearance at night. It is therefore not without reason that night is subdued by daylight. After the creation of light an equal space of twelve hours of day and twelve hours of night formed what is called the equinox of the first day. From the days begin to grow on the night for three months which are the spring season. Then they decline for the next three months, which form the summer season. We arrive again at the equinox, after which the night becomes longer than the day during three months which are

the autumn months; then it loses in turn its length greater than that of the day until the end of the fourth season which is winter. Thus we return to the equinox of the first day in which God created the world, a day that is believed to be the eleventh of the calends of April, which is the first day of the Passover, that is to say, the first day of the first month. In fact, the law ordered the Jews to prepare on the evening of the tenth day of the first month to celebrate the Passover on the fourteenth day of the same month, that is, to begin the eleventh. Now the evening of the tenth day is followed by the dawn of the eleventh, and the eleven of the calends of April is the beginning of the first month. In the beginning the moon was created in its fourteenth day, because all things were made in their entirety. Add three days since the last night, and these are the three days before the stars appeared, and you find that it was the eleven of the calends of April that the world was created, because the number of days of the moon descends from the eleventh to the fourteenth. The first whole month has therefore been assigned for the celebration of the Passover, so that the day of the celebration is never below the eleven of the calends of April, or beyond the fourteenth day of the moon, because it is the eleventh day that the world was made, and on the fourteenth day of the moon a greater light was created more strikingly. Now, between the beginning and that glorious splendor which enlightened the world, our Lord suffered and rose again on the first day called the day of the Lord, because it was made by the Lord, the author of the months which succeed each other, times and years. But this Passover feast is not celebrated everywhere in the same manner, because the course of the moon in its periods of growth and decay is defiantly calculated. "Now the earth was invisible and unformed (Gen. 1:2)." It is evident that the earth at the first moment of its creation was invisible and unformed; it was covered by the waters, so it was invisible, it was unformed, because being liquid, it was not fit for culture. "And the darkness covered the face of the abyss." The sacred writer says that darkness was poured out on the face of the abyss, that is, on the immense surface of the waters. "And the spirit of God was carried on the waters. It was as on the upper part of these waters that the spirit of God was carried, while the darkness covered the infinite depth of the same waters. The spirit of God was on the waters because there was no darkness where the spirit of God was, who, as much as it could, shed light on the waters. But the abyss, that is to say, the immense depth of the waters, was inaccessible to this light; it illuminated the higher waters, and below it reigned the

darkness spread over the whole face of the abyss. Moses calls this spirit the spirit of God, and he wants to make us understand not the Holy Spirit, but a spiritual force that was above the material creature. As he wishes to teach us that everything comes from God, he calls the spirit of God the spirit that was carried on the waters, to destroy that wicked error which causes one to say that God said something that God is not the author of all that exists. For what comes from God is above all the powers and all the principalities, as well as above all the spiritual powers. Let no one be surprised that this spirit is called the spirit of God, when everything evidently comes from God. For God himself, before punishing the earth by the flood, said: "My spirit shall not abide in these men, because they are flesh (Gen. 6:3)." We read also in the prophet Ezekiel, "This is what the Lord says to me: I will stretch out the skin upon you, and I will send in you the spirit and you will live (Ez. 38:5)." Is not it rather the office of the soul than that of the Holy Spirit? Here, then, is the spirit of God, that is to say, an omnipotent virtue, which governed the elements of matter, for his office was to direct them. When God had created the light and regulated the duration of the day, and the second day was over, he made the firmament, that is to say, heaven, so that light was the rule of the day in the firmament and that it was like a torch in a house. Now the firmament was created from the substance of the waters of which we have spoken. The world passes into the organized state; to the confusion of the elements succeeds the distinction of substances, and we see the appearance of the more perfect formations which must be like the members of that great body called the world. Indeed, the elements that were created in the first place were like the materials of the world. However, they are called the world, because these elements have been derived from confusion to produce every kind of creatures and have thus determined this name of world because they had been used for its creation. The firmament, that is to say, the sky, was thus established in the midst of the waters, to separate the waters above the firmament from the waters. The divine power establishes this firmament in the midst of the waters which were below it, in it, above it and around it. It was of a concave form, and sufficiently defenseless by its nature against the invasion of internal or external waters, it was like a well fortified house, which gives security to its inhabitants. On the third day God ordered the waters under the sky, that is to say, in the space formed by the concavity of the firmament to gather together in a single bond, in order to let appear the arid element which is the earth,

and that is so. The whole extent of the earth having been brought to dry, it is like a vast reservoir, in which the waters which were under the heat were precipitated, and the arid element appeared. As the waters had withdrawn, the hitherto invisible earth had to appear visible. God gave to the arid element the name of earth, and he called all these waters gathered together. He then commanded the land to produce plants for food and fruit trees, each according to its kind on the earth. On the fourth day he created great bodies of light in the sky to light the earth, the greater one to begin the day, the lesser to begin the night, and he also placed the stars. These stars are intended to promote the germination, birth and nourishment of all that occurs in the world, to serve as signs to mark times divided into determined spaces, and to be the ornament of the whole world. A house shines by its ornamentation when the vaults are clad in gilded paneling; thus the stars are the ornament of the world by their varied light and brilliance. In the light he had created in the first place, God adds the splendor of the sun, to make of these two beings only one indivisible whole, he then gives to the dark night a luminous body, and as the moon was created in his fourteenth day, Moses said, A lesser luminous body to shine at the beginning of the night, for as soon as it was created it poured out its light throughout the night. The part is taken for the whole in these words: "To shine at the beginning of the night," because the moon does not always shine in the evening. The greater luminous body which we call the sun shines from the beginning of the day, because it has been inseparably united to the light which was created in the first place. The world was therefore three days without these luminous bodies, for there was still nothing on earth that required their presence. But when the earth had produced the plants which were to serve as food, and the fruit trees, the necessity of the stars, which were to develop or preserve them, were felt. As the germination and production of plants are subject to the influence of these stars, they should not be created before the plants, lest any attempt should be made to attribute to them the creation of all the productions of the earth; the plants were to precede, inasmuch as their creation seemed entirely independent of these stars. And on the fifth day God commanded the waters to produce living animals that swim in the water, and birds that fly on the earth under the sky. "And God saw that it was good," and he said, "Grow and multiply." Moses adds, "And God saw that these things were good" to make those who dare to say that they are evil to blush. For as soon as they are pleasing to God their creator, no one has the right to

find them evil. There are those who push the extravagance to the point of saying: "He has seen these things, and he has found them good, a proof that he was ignorant of it before." O fools, how could he have ignored it? All he wanted was done. Can we say that we want what we do not know, and that the one who has the power to do does not know what he is doing? And what is stronger, it will be said that he did not create these things himself, but that he commanded that they be made, and that he who commanded did not have the power to do? But as everything is possible, by commanding what he could not do, he began to have that power which was to turn to his glory. We must therefore admit here a double power in the commandment of inanimate matter to produce animate beings. On the sixth day, God commanded the earth to produce living animals, quadrupeds and other beasts of the earth. And that was so, and the animals were created. And God saw that these things are good and very good, because they are all necessary. That same day God said, "Let us make man in our image and in our likeness, and let him command all the creatures of the earth." God first made all the substances of which the world was to be composed, and it was after the world was organized, clothed with all its ornaments, and provided with all the necessary things, he created man to enjoy the world and all that God had prepared for him. For all other creatures he commanded the waters and the earth to produce them; but when it was a question of making man, the sacred author represents him taking from the silt of the earth, to teach us the difference which separated man from all that he had created up to that time. It is in order to raise the dignity of man that he describes it to us from the hands of God, and made in the image and likeness of God, that is, of the Father and the Son. We have spoken elsewhere of this image and likeness of God; however, the opportunity and the matter we are dealing with require that we talk about it again. It is the Father who says to his Son: "Let us make man in our image and in our likeness," and the very act of creation is the work of two persons, one speaking and one listening. This image of God is thus in man in the sense that he was created alone, as a master from whom all others were to come, and who was invested with the authority of God as his substitute, for every king bears the image of God. For this reason the woman was not made in the image of God, for thus is Moses saying: And God created man, and he made him in the likeness of God. What the Apostle says: "For man, he must not cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God, but the woman veils her head because she is neither the glory nor the image

of God (I Cor. 11:7)." The likeness of God in man consists in the fact that woman comes from man as the son comes from the father, with that very great difference which woman has been made, and that the son is born. There are some who believe that God created everything simultaneously. If he has done everything by his word, they say, why should he not have done everything simultaneously? However, it is generally believed that God created the world successively. It is believed that it is from the greatness of the divine power that it was created all in one day. Let us consider how great is the providence of God in this mode of successive creation. He could certainly create everything simultaneously, but multiplied reasons prevented it, and to enter into no detail we must believe in the divine Scripture which often says and repeats: "The Lord your God made in six days heaven and earth, the sea and all that they contain." All these things must have been done thus to make men feel and know that they were created. Seeing that not all the creatures had existed simultaneously, but that some had been created today, others the another day, they recognized that they had had a beginning and that they could not in any way claim to eternity, since their creation had been partial and successive. If all the creatures had existed simultaneously, they would not have the feeling of their infirmity, and would imagine that they had no beginning, for the things which are the simultaneous product of the word of God, perceive that they have been created; for this reason they must have been made, the naked first, the others second. And so that beings who have been created at first do not regard themselves as imperfect, seeing themselves create more excellent beings, they attribute to themselves the same perfection which they consider in others. Thus the light which is called the day was preceded by heaven and earth, that is, by water and the arid element. Now, as the water, the arid element, and the darkness were plunged in the confusion of chaos, they could not claim eternity for them, since none of these elements had any definite state or property. The sun and the moon, the most brilliant stars, were preceded by many created beings. It is thus that the more excellent beings who have been created the last, and the first created, who are less perfect, cannot ascribe to each other an eternal existence. Moreover, the work of creation, which was consummated in six days, is the symbol of the duration of the whole world, that is to say, that the works of the six days represent six thousand years, to be accomplished successively in each century, is found in the works of the six days. So did not be so widespread on earth; this is why the first days of the

creation are unclear; animals are created before man, because the first men must live in ignorance, and follow their coarse instincts as animals; and man is created on the sixth day, because it is in the sixth millennium that the advent of Christ came to give man a new creation which anchored him from the tyranny of death. Man is created in the image of God because he owes his grace to bear in his soul the image of the Son of God, to the testimony of the apostle St. John: "We know that when he comes in his glory we shall be like him (I Jn. 3:2)." And the Apostle Paul says, "We are in conformity with the image of the Son of God (Rom. 8:29)." The tree of life which was planted in paradise was the image of the future grace of God, that is to say, of the body of the Lord who gives to him feeds on eternal life. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil signifies the law given by Moses, who, by making known the sin that was hidden before, gave mankind the knowledge of good and evil. God rests on the seventh day of all his works, because the sixth millennium completed, he will rest in the seventh with the world that will cease all its works. We have chosen these considerations among several others to facilitate the understanding of these truths according to the principles which we have explained.

### **(Genesis 1:1)**

#### **1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 2. WHY DID GOD CREATE THE WORLD?** — God made the world because he is the supreme craftsman, or if he is challenged by this title, let it be said openly; but his works themselves show it clearly. Will I be asked: before he created them, were all things in nothingness, or what was there before creation? The correct ones answers this question in a few words: "It is in him that we have life, movement and being," (Acts 17:28), that is, all things are in God, because He is everywhere, and since He existed alone from all eternity before all things, in a manner invisible to every creature, and so as not to evade this mystery, or rather to ignore why the world was made. We say that the devil, by his apostasy, has led a great number of angels, that is to say, the spiritual powers in his prevarication, when he wished, in his proud impiety, to usurp the very throne of God. This is what the prophet is saying when he says, "How did you come down

from heaven, shining star, son of the dawn?" (Isa. 14:12) that is to say, was more brilliant than all the stars. He was the leader of many legions which he surpassed all in splendor, and at the head of which he engaged this sacrilegious combat. He saw beneath him a multitude of spiritual powers, and as the knowledge of the mysteries of heaven raised him in paradise above all others, he wanted to be called God. Every day he finds imitators in the present life, who are proud to see a multitude of soldiers gathered around them, want to exploit this hearth of conspiracy which is offered to them by their followers, and seek to usurp the sovereign authority. It was then that God, willing to punish his presumption, not by his power, but by reason, created matter which was a confused mass of elements that served to create the world. In establishing the distinction in this confusion, God gave the world that order, that brightness which we admire. The elements having separated from each other, formed by their arrangement what we call the world, because each thing distinctly separated from each other, coincided with its formation. As for the man placed on this earth, he is a compound of two natures, one superior, the other inferior, one celestial, the other terrestrial, and his creation clearly establishes the sovereign authority of a single God who made man not only by his word, but in his image, and created him alone to be the source from which the human race was to emerge. God wanted to create only one man to establish that all things come from one principle, and that there is therefore only one God, so that the higher creature learns for its confusion the truth by example of the man who had been created from the earth. From that moment the devil became the enemy of man. He sensed that the man had been created to accuse him; so he put into action all the subtleties of his nature to drag him into the prevarication in which he had fallen himself, and thus share his condemnation with his accuser. He promised him, therefore, as the fruit of his disobedience, the divinity, who, by attempting to usurp him by his pride, was precipitated into the abyss. Now, as every nature is free by its creation of every evil principle, it takes its name from its accidents. The thing signified precedes the name which must signify it. Thus the composition of the names of Satan and devil come from his works, and are the expression not of his nature, but of his will. Now, that the eternal purposes and decrees of God in the creation of man would have, and that the devil had made the height of the crime that had precipitated man into ruin, Christ deigned to descend from heaven on earth, to deliver man from the penalty of his disobedience and to

make known the punishments reserved for the devil, and to turn men away from imitating his conduct. This is why the apostle Saint John says: "The Son of God came into the world to destroy the works of the devil" (1 Jn. 3:8). Now, if he were evil by nature, it would be folly or injustice to predict punishment. Who dreams of condemning the one whom he sees acting only according to his nature? Who is angry at the fire, because it burns, against the water, because it cools, both acting in it only according to their nature and not by an act of their will? If, then, the devil were evil in his nature, he would not have a will here. He would be incapable of discernment and he would behave like a blind man to all things in one and the same way. On the contrary, he acts with a certain discernment; he spares those who do his will, he uses concealment and neophiles, he sows obstacles and impediments under the feet of those who want to resort to the protection of God; he pitches his servants with pitfalls, and he declares himself especially against those who obey more faithfully the divine wills. It is therefore obvious that his will is all in the wrong. This is why the Apostle St. Peter tells us: "Be sober and watch, for the demon your enemy surrounds you like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour." (2 Pet. 5:8) It is not the pagans, it is not the Jews, it is not the people of bad life and manners he attacks, it is the faithful servants of God and Jesus Christ that he knows how to be his enemies, because they condemn his enterprise and his pride. When the law was given, his jealousy became more ardent against those who lived under him, because he knew that the law taught men the existence of one God, and the rules of a pure and holy life. If therefore we believe that the devil acts only by virtue of his nature, we cannot admit that he is guilty, because he acts how he can act according to his nature, and that he does not do what he cannot do, because it is contrary to his nature. He deserves neither praise nor condemnation; his actions are harmful, nor condemnation, because he does not act voluntarily, but by the impulse of his nature. We know that men with sudden madness have wounded their fellows with sticks, swords, stones, or by their bites, and that they have killed even some of them. They have been taken with care by their persons to bring them before the tribunals. They declared them innocent because they had not acted knowingly and voluntarily, but under the impulse of some kind of force, trained. How indeed to establish the guilt of a man who does not know what he did? If therefore the devil does not know the good, why judge him worthy of condemnation, because he does not do what he does not know? On the contrary, if

it were possible, he would be rather praiseworthy because he does what he does not know. For us, it is with all justification that we have become guilty because we do not do what we know we must do; or because we do what we know how to defend ourselves. Now all the Scriptures agree with declaring the devil guilty; that is why we read that the torment of hell is reserved to him, and that the divine law condemned him without return, because he did evil while knowing and being able to do good. God, indeed, justice itself, would not condemn him for not doing the good he did not know, but for doing the evil he knew. I therefore regard it as an incontestable truth, that no substance can be called bad, because all evil, as we have shown, derives from the will which has come to vitiate nature by means of the senses.

### (Genesis 1:1)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 28. WHAT CAN WE SAY TO THOSE WHO CLAIM THAT THIS WORLD EXISTS NATURALLY FROM ALL ETERNITY, AND THAT IT HAS NEITHER BEGINNING NOR END? —** That the world exists from eternity and that it is independent, is both implausible and impossible. We see him composed of a multitude of diverse bodies; Now, simplicity is the essential attribute of a divine and eternal being; it must present no diversity, but the most perfect unity. The world is not even uniform in the succession of times; not only are there differences of time and contrary substances, but the succession of times is not regular. Now an eternal substance is sovereignly removed from all diversity, it is not accessible to touch or sight, because it is incorporeal. The world on the contrary is subject to the alteration, the water is in opposition with the fire; if the fire becomes stronger, it triumphs over the water, and the earth, in its turn, dry and cold nature, flames up like a material thing. We cannot, therefore, admit the eternity of this world which we see subjected to so many changes and alterations, which wears and ages from century to century, and which we believe we must someday end. But what must we think of the man who believes the eternal world? Man certainly begins to exist in the world; Now, before it existed, what was the use of the annual fertility of the earth? Shall we say that this fertility existed without any design or

as chance? And how could an eternal being produce corruptible and mortal beings, whereas an eternal being can only come out an eternal being? How yet dare to call eternal what is seen, what is felt, and what is touched? How is eternal to call what is subject to the succession of times, a succession itself which is not always uniform or regular? For eternity is not subject to no alteration, and has no change.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 3. WHAT NEED WAS IT TO MAKE IT KNOWN BY MOSES THE BEGINNING OF THE WORLD AND THE ORDER OF CREATION, AND NOT BEFORE HIM?** — This story should not have been written before Moses, because creation had not yet given rise to such great errors among men. But it became necessary as soon as these errors spread in the human race, until the children of Israel heard the philosophers of Egypt who had instructed Moses in all the sciences of the Egyptians, which contradicted the truth of creation and affirmed that a certain Apis had created this world by means of the evil angels, and that Satan is the prince of this world. Marcion adopted this sense for his ruin. The Manichaeans claim that this same Satan created man, but not the world, and in this they are more insane than others. For it is a certain truth that the world was created for man, and they come to say that God created this world, though of a foreign matter, while man was created by his enemy, that is to say, one would have placed a master in the house of the other. Moses, therefore, had to point out and destroy this error, to teach that the creation of man as of the world had God alone as Master. The authority given to Moses by the miracles and wonders he performed guaranteed the truth of his teaching, supported by such testimonies. Indeed, who would refuse to believe the author of such great miracles? That is why those who contradict this doctrine are easily convinced of error, because they have only their word as supporter of their affirmations. Moses wishing to demonstrate that nothing is co-eternal with God, first explains the order in which creation was made, the creatures less important first and then the most important, proving that none absolutely was uncreated. Indeed, those of a later creation have greater excellence. To those who sought to excite the time when the former were created, may oppose their inferiority of nature which subjects them to those which are their posterior

origin. If, on the contrary, they claim primacy in favor of the more excellent creatures, their pretensions are opposed by the rank of order they occupy in creation. So that there is none which has not had a beginning. Above all, God created heaven and earth (Gen. 1:1). Then the light destined to light the day. Then the sky, and the clusters of waters which receive the name of the sea, and above which appeared the habitable earth. The earth which Moses presents to us as having been made after heaven, is not entirely the earth properly so called, but all the lower creatures and all the material elements. The sky which was created in the beginning is not this visible heaven, but the higher and spiritual heaven. Therefore when Moses tells us that God first made heaven and earth, he hears of all things invisible in heaven, and by the earth all the visible things God created. By thus uniting the two extreme terms of all nature, he establishes in a certain manner that all intermediate beings must have been created equally. The stars which he placed in order to regulate the order of the universe were created on the fourth day, and the time of their creation is in reverse relation to the excellence of their nature. As for man, he created him on the sixth day, in order to introduce him only in a perfectly completed dwelling. Now the man we see created on the sixth day is far superior to all other creatures, and this superiority comes above all from his inner nature, invisible and endowed with intelligence. The sun is the brightest, and the moon is brighter than the earth. This is why some people do not like the saying of Genesis, And God saw that the light was good (Gen. 1:4). As they asserted that all creatures had an evil principle as their author, and that they could not believe in their goodness. Moses, in order to establish the goodness of all things created, shows that God found them good in proportion as he made them, and thus condemns him who would be tempted to find them evil. How can we suppose that he who said, Let there be light, and there was light (Gen. 1:3), did not know the light? Can we do what we do not know? Now the light as soon as it was made, pleased the one who had made it. What craftsman does not find his joy in his work? This is why it is written, And he saw that the light was good (Gen. 1:4). And yet there are those who maintain that it is bad. What would it be if God had left this truth without witness? Thus, after the account of the creation of the world, Moses reveals the succession of the human race from the first man, first by Seth, who replaced Abel (Cf. Gen. 4:25), and by order to Abraham, the father of the Jewish people. He shows that Abraham believed in the Creator God of the world, and that

this same God gave the law in which were contained the promises of the future Christ who was to deliver mankind from the tyranny of the devil. It is through these authorities that we prove how reasonable our faith is. For this account of the origins of the world makes this testimony to our faith that Christians go back to the beginning of the world. In fact, from Seth, the sons of Adam, we descend to Enoch; from Enoch to Noah; from Noah to Abraham; from Abraham to David; from David to Mary, from whom Jesus Christ is born through the operation of the Holy Spirit. All those who in ancient times have faith in one God, whom the Savior preached, deserve the name of Christians. For the promise of the Savior to come is from the beginning of the world. This is why St. John calls him in his Apocalypse, "The Lamb slain from the beginning of the world. (Rev. 13:8.) Christians have always existed. All those, of whom I have spoken, who have existed since the first man, and through whom we come to the Savior, have faith in that God of whom Jesus Christ said: and eternal life consists in knowing you the only true God, and the one you sent, Jesus Christ (Jn. 17:2). But can we not make this objection: If all those you speak of were Christians before the coming of the Savior, what knowledge did Jesus bring to us? The advent of Jesus Christ has developed the understanding of this truth, because preaching has revealed the mystery which this unique God contained, the properties of each divine person, and that to make us fulfill the righteousness of the law, Jesus Christ gave us the graces that God kept in reserve.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT <b>(Gen. 1:2)</b>	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT <b>(Gen. 1:2)</b>
<b>QUESTION 41. WAS THE SPIRIT THAT WAS CARRIED ON THE WATERS THE HOLY SPIRIT, AS THESE WORDS WOULD SEEM TO INDICATE: "THE SPIRIT OF GOD WAS CARRIED ON THE WATERS?" —</b> If there is an error in this proposal, we should admit it. Some believe that it is a question of the Holy Spirit, because it is called the	<b>QUESTION 2. THE SPIRIT WHO WAS CARRIED ON THE WATERS, MUST HE BE TAKEN FOR THE HOLY SPIRIT, BECAUSE IT IS WRITTEN, "THE SPIRIT OF GOD WAS CARRIED ON THE WATERS?" —</b> It is therefore necessary here to appeal to the intellect to discern the things which have a common name. Thus the name of spirit

Spirit of God, an opinion devoid of all proof and all foundation. Not only do order and reason refuse the interpretation, but the text itself is powerless to establish it. For we frequently find the same words used by sacred writers in another sense. Thus, among other things, the Lord God said: "My spirit shall not abide in these men, because they are flesh; (Gen. 6:5), and he adds: "Exterminate every creature, from man to animals." Will it be said that in these words, where the Lord predicts the deluge which he is to send on earth, it is a question of the Holy Spirit? Did he not wish to speak of souls? For the name of spirit is given not only to our souls, those of animals. Indeed, it is written: "And all flesh in which the spirit of life was found died in the waters." (Gen. 7:21) We also read in the prophet Ezekiel when God promises by his mouth the resurrection of the human race: "This is what the Lord says: I will stretch the skin upon you, and I will give you of my spirit, and you shall live (Ez. 37:5)." Is this the question of the Holy Spirit, or rather did he not wish to speak of the soul? All heavenly creatures are spirits, but they diverge from each other; God himself is spirit (Jn. 4:24), but of a very different nature. Every spirit, then, is of the spirit of God, but is not God, however, except the spirit which is of itself, and whose particular character is sanctity. Men are also called the sons of God, as Jesus Christ is called Himself the Son

is given to God, to the soul of man, to the wind, to the air, to the soul of animals, to angels and all creatures who have received to live of their own nature. But intelligence here helps you to discern that God is called mind very differently from creatures, so you understand that Jesus Christ and men are called the Son of God in a very different sense. Whenever Scripture wishes to designate the spirit which is properly of God, it adds: the Holy Spirit; it thus excludes every idea of a creature, and makes it understood that the spirit being of God, can itself be nothing but God. Moses describing the creation of the nature, that is to say, the confusion of all things which was deprived of all feeling, represents to us the spirit of God carried on the earth, on the abyss and on the darkness, to make us understand by this name and the place where the spirit was carried, that it was a question of a superior creature which we call spiritual. For this reason he represents this spirit as being carried over the waters, and he wanted to designate a creature, for every creature of God is carried by the virtue of him who gave it existence. Now, how could it be in the order that the Holy Spirit was carried over the waters, he who, by the confession of all, is above all creature? If Jesus Christ is at the right hand of God above all heaven (Col. 4), the Holy Spirit is also there. Beings who have the same excellence and the same nature are inseparable. We confess, no doubt,

of God, but there is this difference that He is the true Son of God, and that men are only His adopted sons. The same difference exists in the use of this name of spirit of God. The Holy Spirit comes from God, it is consubstantial; the other spirits are called the spirits of God, but they are mere creatures. The order itself refuses to admit that it was the Holy Spirit who was carried on the waters. Reason teaches us that above the waters there exists a spiritual creature which has above itself a more excellent creature, because one creature differs in clarity from another creature (1 Cor. 15:41); for the more the heavenly creatures are near the throne of God, the more brilliant are their ministries. That is why the angel Raphael said to Tobit, "I am the angel Raphael, one of the seven holy angels who stand and spend their lives in the presence of the majesty of God. (Tob. 12:15)

that God, that is to say the Almighty Trinity, is everywhere, yet we attribute to him that singular honor of being above every creature as a privilege of his own. That is why we say, "Our Father who are in heaven," and "Who dwells in an inaccessible light."

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 107. SUCCESSION OF THE DAY AND NIGHT.** — According to the order followed in the creation of the world, we see that the darkness preceded the light. In fact, the elements which were to serve the creation of the world, and which were created simultaneously, appear to us to be devoid of light (Gen. 1:2), that is to say, water, earth, darkness of which the world has been formed, that is, of an invisible or dark matter, as it is said in the book of Wisdom, whose author is Solomon. (Wis. 11:18.) The Holy Letters attest that darkness and water were created when they related these words of God in the prophet Isaiah: "I, God, have

made light, I created the darkness (Isa. 45:47)." The Holy Spirit also teaches us by the mouth of David that the waters were created and the earth was established on the waters (Ps. 135:9), which is according to the authority of the Gospel (Jn. 1:3), and to the tradition of the apostles, who testify that all things have been done; and for nothing to be excepted, the Apostle takes care to say, "Let the things that are in heaven, or those that are on the earth (Col. 1:16)." As far as the earth is concerned, we read that the darkness existed before the light, as to the order followed in creation and not as to excellence, for the light is worth a thousand times better than the darkness. Now in the organization of the world the light receives the name of day, and the darkness the name of night; that is to say, when the light ceases to illuminate the darkness, the time which passes until the return of the light is called night, and the time when it penetrates the darkness of its light is called day. It is said, then, that it is night when one is in the hope of the day to come, and that it is day when one is waiting for the night to follow. When the succession of day and night has ceased with the end of the world, there will be nothing but darkness and light. Indeed, it can no longer be said that it is night when the darkness will be continuous, nor that it is day when the light will have no more decline. Eternity stops the use of those names that began with the world. Thus, before the creation of the light which received the name of day, it is not read that there is night, but darkness; and after the disappearance of the light which shines upon them, they have received the name of evening and night. As far as we can judge, night is subordinated to the day. From what we read that darkness existed before light, it does not follow that they are preferable to light; For heaven existed before the sun, and yet the sun is superior to it; the earth was created before man as well as the beasts of the fields and other animals, and yet they are subjected to man. The night, therefore, must not be above the day, because we read that the darkness has preceded, since light prevails much over darkness, and day is much preferable to night. As we said above, light was created when the darkness existed. "And God gave the light the name of day, and darkness the name of night, and evening and morning was the first day." If there were not in the day, there would have been no night, for it was when the darkness ceased to be enlightened, when the day was gone reads that evening elapsed. And when the light came to shine after the evening, it formed the first day after the night, so that night came after the day. It is worthy, indeed, and in conformity with reason, that the inferior nature is in

everything subject to a more excellent nature. Why then put the night before daybreak, since its name comes only after the name of day? For it had not received the name of night or evening, if the light had not shone for the space of a day, after which the evening was set at night. The day becomes evening to make you understand that night is a part of the day, for the day is complete only when the night is past. Thus we say, The year is three hundred and sixty-five days, and we do not separate from it the nights. In counting the days, we also count the nights which are included under the name of days. If, on the contrary, the night was preceding the day, the day would be understood under the name of night. Who ever thought of saying, "I will see you after five nights, and not after five days." Nowhere, if we have a good memory, we read that night is set before daylight. "Moses," says the Scriptures, "was on the mountain forty days and forty nights (24:18)." The Psalmist also says, "The sun shall not bother you during the day, nor the moon in the night." And to borrow an example from the beginning of the world, we read in Genesis: "Let the bodies of light be made in the sky, and shine on the earth (Ps. 120:6), one bigger to start the day, the other less great to start the night. Now the moon cannot be placed above the sun, just as night cannot be placed above the light; but night is subordinate to the day as the moon is in the sun. The Gospel also shows us the nights included under the name and in the enumeration of days. "There are some," says the Savior, "who are here present, who shall not die till they have seen the reign of God." And he adds: "And it came to pass about a week after, and so on (Jn. 1:28)." Are not the nights included in these eight days? And in another place: "This," says the Evangelist, "took place in Bethany beyond the Jordan, where John baptized. The next day, John saw Jesus coming to him (Jn. 1:28)." Did he say: The next night? Further on he says, "The next day Jesus wanted to go to Galilee," and in the following chapter: "Three days after that, a wedding was celebrated and Cana was celebrated in Galilee (Jn. 11:1)." Everywhere the day has pre-eminence over the night which is subordinate to it. If the day was understood under the name of night, night would precede the day. The Romans reign over the Spaniards, the Gauls, the Africans, and the other peoples who are subject to them, and by this very reason these people take the name of Romans; thus the night which is subordinate to the day is included under the name of day. The reason for this is that the Jews begin the celebration of the Sabbath in the evening, and they do not consider the reason for this commandment. The day

before, they must buy and prepare their food for the sabbath day, and purify themselves according to the law. Now, can they do these things during the night and begin the Sabbath with the rising of the day? There is no doubt that the resurrection of our Lord took place at night; yet it is in the day that it is honored. It is in the day that this resurrection is celebrated, and that day is called the day of the Lord. Do you not read in the Psalms: "This is the day which the Lord hath made? (Ps. 117:24)" We do not say the night of the Lord, because the day has primacy here. Whether it be a matter of the past or of the day to come, night is always subordinate to it, because it is of an inferior nature, to the apostle's testimony: "You are the children of the day and the day light, and not of night and darkness (I Thess. 5:5)." If we wish to take an example in consuls, we shall see that the first named is the one who was the first chosen. Is it not customary to say, "Who will be consul with him?" If night was before daylight, it would be named first. It is so true that it is by day that we begin to count time, that if, for example, we say: tomorrow is the sixth of the calends, we mean all the space which flows from one morning to another and which is composed of one whole day and one night. So again the moon at the beginning of the world was created on the fourteenth day, for it must have gleamed all night, and the next morning was its fifteenth day. How, then, can any doubt remain about the pre-eminence of the day? The disputes of a certain number have compelled us to extend ourselves at length to an obvious matter, for the text of Scripture alone is sufficient to conclude the question, since it clearly shows us the day before the night. All the reasons we have explained are borrowed from the history of the origin of the world. But if we wish to elevate ourselves to higher considerations, by giving our spirit a spiritual vigor, we shall see that it is improper to affirm that darkness was created before light. If the nature of light is celestial and the nature of earthly darkness, it is absurd to think that light was made after the darkness. Moses says that light has been made, but for the part of the world that it illuminates, and it does not say that it only then began to exist. Indeed, all spiritual beings were created before material beings, and the light that already existed in the higher regions descended into the lower ones to shine like a flaming beam in a house. But for what reason is the darkness named before the light, since it always follows the light? Let us say that celestial and spiritual things are enlightened by their nature, whereas earthly and fleshly things are darkness, so that the nature of darkness appears to subsist only by the power of

light, because all that is inferior depends on which is above. If we look carefully, we will find darkness even in the sun. Place yourself near it, it will appear to you so striking that you cannot look at it; move away a little, its radiance will be the same, but you can stop your gaze for a moment; but it is less brilliant, and its brilliance is always diminished by reason of your separation. There is in it, then, as a successive weakening which proclaims the darkness, and this point that the darkness appears to spring from the light. The one who made the light also created darkness, in the way that in creating the water he created the earth at the same time; and the darkness is the defect of light, as the earth is the solid part of the waters. God is the only one who has no decline, and although he is everywhere, and contains all things in himself, his splendor is so striking that he cannot be seen by anyone, does not consent to temper His brilliance. The Savior himself, when clothed in a body, was visible only when he wished, even without being shut up. The glorious glory in the midst of which he appeared on the mountain in his transfiguration, remained hidden in his body, and manifested itself externally only when he wished it (Matt. 17:1). One, how was he hidden without being shut up? If he could enter with his body in the place where his disciples were, and when the doors were closed, how could his divinity not penetrate all things? that is to say that its rays cannot be intercepted because it suffers no decline. God therefore fills everything with His presence, but we say, however, that He is the place where He appears and wants to manifest Himself to the gaze. All things are in God, because he is above all things, to the apostle's testimony: "It is in him that we have life, movement and being (Acts 17:28)," however, it is only in that which he wishes to be. He is in everything by the mystery of his immensity, and he manifests himself by an eloquence and his providence only in whatever he desires.

### (Genesis 1:26)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 24. WHY, SINCE MAN AND WOMAN ARE ONE FLESH, IS MAN THE IMAGE OF GOD AND NOT WOMAN?** — Man and woman, it is true, have the same substance in their souls as in their bodies, but man is superior in dignity to woman, as the Apostle says: "The husband is the head of the wife

(Eph. 5:27; I Cor. 11:3)." It is by the will of God, and not by his nature, that man is superior to woman. Thus, in the same body, there are members more or less considerable, not by their nature, but by the rank which has been given them.

### **(Genesis 1:26)**

#### **1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 45. HOW WAS MAN MADE IN THE IMAGE OF GOD, CREATED TO COMMAND, AND SO IS WOMAN?** — "Let us," says God, "make man in our image and likeness." There are some who want to hear these words in the same way as those others where God says again: "Come, go down and let us confuse their tongues." (Gen. 11:17) To see only the mark of the letter, these words are similar, it is the voice of one who speaks in the plural; but the meaning is far from the same, because the circumstances are quite different. On one side is the creation of man, whom God wants to create in his image and likeness. These words, on the contrary, "come, go down, and let us confuse their tongues," were intended to prevent men from coming to an understanding. We can therefore admit that God speaks here to his angels, like a general to his army. He speaks here in the plural and collectively, because it is through them that he must act as their Creator, and that is why he says: Let us confuse their languages. When he says: Let us make man in our image and likeness, we cannot say that he is speaking to angels, for we cannot say that angels have the same image with God, as a general with his soldiers. Those who have the same image cannot have a different dignity, a different nature. Besides, the sacred writer adds: "And God has made man, and has appointed him in his image," that is, it is God who speaks, and God who acts, he is not another God, a different God, it is one and the same God. This language from one subject to another does not imply another nature, but another person. For although there is only one God, there are three persons, and there is only one God, because in the Son, as in the Holy Spirit, there is only one God, only one and the same nature, for everything that comes out of this nature can only be what God is himself. It is therefore the person of the Father who says, "Let us make," and the person of the Son who makes man in the image of God, either in the image of the Father or in his own, does not matter, since they have

one and the same image. Now, the Son has made man by the Holy Spirit, for just as Scripture represents the Father acting through the Son, so the Son acts by the Holy Spirit, as He declares Himself: It is through the Spirit of God that I cast out demons. (Matt. 12) The image of the three divine persons is therefore the same, since, whether we consider the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit, it is one God. Thus one man was made in the image of one God. Now, man is made in the image of God in the sense that just as there is in the heavens only one God, through whom all the heavenly spirits subsist, there was also on the earth only one man of God, which all others would derive their origin according to the flesh. There are, however, some who think that man was made in the image of God in the power he received to command, because God said to him, "Let him rule over the fish of the sea, birds of heaven and all over the earth," as we see all these things subject not only to the man, but to the woman, who is certainly not made in the image of God. This view is false for two reasons, firstly because it would follow that it was not to the Son that God would have said, "Let us make man in our image and likeness," but to the celestial powers that the Apostle enumerates, if the image of God stamped on man is the power of command; and secondly because the woman would be made herself in the image of God, which is an absurdity. For how can one say of the woman that she is in the image of God, whom we see subject to the empire of man without having any authority? For she can neither teach nor lay in justice, nor commit her word, nor judge, how much less can she command?

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT  (Genesis 1:27)	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT  (Genesis 1:27)
<b>QUESTION 21.</b> IN WHAT SENSE IS IT TO BE UNDERSTOOD THAT GOD MADE MAN IN HIS IMAGE AND LIKENESS, AND IS WOMAN ALSO THE IMAGE OF GOD? — Man was made in the image of God in the sense that the one and only God made one man, and that just as all things come from one God, all	<b>QUESTION 1.</b> HOW CAN WE UNDERSTAND THAT GOD CREATED MAN IN HIS IMAGE AND LIKENESS, AND CAN WE SAY THAT WOMAN IS THE IMAGE OF GOD? — Man was made in the image of God in the sense that the one and only God made one man, etc.

mankind also descends from one only man. It was created in its likeness, because, just as the Son comes from the Father, so woman is formed of man to consecrate the authority of a single principle. But the Son was born of God the Father in an incomprehensible and unintelligible manner; the woman, on the contrary, as we read, was formed outwardly of man (Gen. 2:21) to give birth to other men. The Son of God was born so that all things were created by him. This is the difference. The Son was born God of God the Father, whereas woman was formed of man, for simplicity is one of the attributes of the divine nature, and a simple being can only emerge from a simple nature, a spirit, a God of a God. Man is therefore the image of God, as it is written, *God created man, and created him in the image of God* (Gen. 1:27). This is why the Apostle says: "Man should not cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God; the woman, to the contrary; must put a veil over his head. (I Cor. 11:7) Why? Because she is not the image of God. It is for the same reason that he says elsewhere: "I do not allow women to teach or take authority over their husbands (1 Tim. 2:12)."

**(Genesis 1:31, 7:2)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 9. IF ALL THE CREATURES THAT GOD MADE WERE GOOD AND VERY GOOD, WHY DID HE SAY TO NOAH, "BRING WITH YOU INTO THE ARK OF PURE AND UNCLEAN ANIMALS, SINCE NO ONE CAN CALL GOOD WHAT IS UNCLEAN?" (GEN. 1:31; 7:2) —** These words only make a question because they have several meanings. If we consider the circumstance in question, they give rise to no difficulty, because things are themselves explained by the rank which they occupy. We call common what is not divided, sometimes that which is unclean. Thus the apostle St. Peter says: "I have never eaten anything common or unclean (Acts 10:14)," and St. Paul: "All that does not come from faith is sin (Rom. 14:23)," and elsewhere, "The law does not come from faith (Gal. 3:12)," and yet it is not a sin. You see, therefore, that the same expression does not always have the same meaning. When, therefore, a thing is qualified as impure, it is necessary to consider in what sense, for it is sometimes given this qualification only by comparison with a more perfect thing, sometimes, on the contrary, they wish to express by impure and truly evil works. No substance is evil in its nature, and things which are naturally called evil are only evil by comparison with more excellent natures. Thus, a dog is said to be impure in comparison with a sheep, lead is unclean if compared with gold, the raven when compared to the peacock. In the same body there are members more honorable than the others, and we know that they are not bad. All things therefore are good in their nature, because all are useful.

**(Genesis 2:7)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 23. DO SOULS COME BY WAY OF PROPAGATION LIKE BODIES? —** It seems to me unseemly to say that souls are engendered simultaneously with bodies, and that the soul gives birth to the soul, a property which God has not given to the soul. If each of the celestial powers has been given

the power to give existence to all others in creation, one might admit that all souls derive from the one soul of Adam. But this feeling is not admissible, because the generation of a simple being is a privilege which God has exclusively reserved for himself. This generation, considered in the person of the Savior, is so mysterious that not only pagans and Jews, but even those who call themselves Christians, regard it as an incredible thing. Indeed, the Photinians and the Arians reject this article of faith and refuse to believe that God has begotten. Will it be said that at the moment when the germ of the body is sown, the soul begets the soul? But we read that God drew a rib of Adam without the sacred writer adding that the soul gave birth to the soul. If a soul were joined to this seed, it cannot be said that this soul was born, it is a part detached from another soul. Nor does Scripture say anything about this circumstance. We read, on the contrary, in the prophet Zechariah: "God who has formed in man the spirit of man (Zech. 12:1)." He speaks the same truth when he says, "This is what the Lord has said to you who created you, who formed you in your mother's womb (Is. 44:2)." If the soul is formed in the womb of the mother, it is united to a body which has already received its form. As it extends its action to all the members of the body, it is said of the soul that it is formed in the body. Thus, just as water, which has no particular form, receives one from the vessel that contains it, the soul, incorporeal and simple substance, receives as its form in the body by communicating life to all its members. This is what Moses expresses even more clearly in these words: "If men quarrel, and one strike a woman with child, and she miscarry indeed, but live herself: he shall be answerable for so much damage as the woman's husband shall require, and as arbiters shall award" (Exod. 21:22), words which prove that the soul is not united to the body before it is formed. If to the seed of the body is joined with the incorporeal seed of the soul, a great number of souls perish daily, when the seed is lost without being followed by birth. But if we look at it more closely, we will see the feeling that we need to adopt. Consider the creation of Adam. In the person of Adam we have an example which makes us understand that the body was already formed when it received its soul. God could doubtless mix the soul with the silt of the earth and thus form the body. But a sovereign reason presided over his formation; it was necessary first to construct and assemble the different parts of the house before introducing the one which was to inhabit it. The soul being a spirit cannot dwell in a solid element; it is for this reason that it is said to be shed in the

blood. When, then, the lineaments of the body are not yet formed, where can the soul be? Shall it go abroad, until it be united? But reason teaches us that it exists only to animate the body, and not to wander without fulfilling any function. Now let those who think differently tell us from whom the soul comes. Is it man or woman? Will they say of the woman? We cannot accept this thought because the example in question is contrary to it. For they say that the soul was given to the woman with the seed that was drawn from man, this thought is debated, as we have seen, for a great number of reasons. Perhaps one will be tempted to say that the soul is given by woman, especially because of the Savior, who was born of woman by the operation of the Holy Spirit, apart from any carnal union. But this thought gives too much to woman by attributing to her a right and an authority which belongs to man. Moreover, they assert that it is from man that the origin of the body and the soul originates, and now, changing their minds, they attribute to woman the origin of the most excellent nature, of the soul, and to man the origin of the less perfect nature, that is to say of the body, whereas it is manifest that one cannot change the order that God followed in the example he gave us.

### (Genesis 2:7)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 123. DID ADAM HAVE THE HOLY SPIRIT?** — I discovered that some of our brethren who have not made a thorough study of the Scriptures, claim with a certain simplicity that Adam as soon as he was created, received the Holy Spirit as it is now given to the faithful, and that he lost the Spirit by his sin. They rely on a feeling supported by a great number, that the reparation of man has taken place by faith which has restored him to his former state, and restored to him all that Adam had received from his creation. Moreover, they say, man has been created perfect, which can only be admitted as much as he has received the Holy Spirit. For me, I declare that not only man, but all things that God has made, he has created them in a state of perfection, although it cannot be said that they have received the Holy Spirit. All species of animals are perfect in their kind to complete the end of their creation, so man is perfect in his kind, in that he can discern the evil of good, the error of truth. He is an intelligent animal, perfect for the purpose

God has created by creating him. He is endowed at the same time with speech, thought, and action, and accomplishes by intelligence what he cannot do by his power. How, then, have we dared to say that man must be born perfect with the absolute knowledge of all things, while it is evident that he knows nothing but what he learns? What he does not learn, he does not know. Thus, he does not know what he is, because it is not the object of his study here below, but he who does not know what he is, how can he know everything, although it is less difficult to know oneself than to know all the other things? But as his mind turns to these things, instead of studying himself, he acquires knowledge of what is outside of him, without knowing himself, without knowing whether he existed before or after his body. If man had been created in a state of perfection which would have excluded all need, it would not have been a man, but a god, and he would not have yielded to the seduction which was the cause of his sin. But to have the Holy Spirit in oneself is a privilege above the natural perfection of man and which gives him the power to do the things of God. Did the ass who spoke to Balaam not do an action superior to his nature? (Num. 22:28) It was given the faculty to do what was not in its nature. but in ours. But because man is of a nature superior to that of animals, does it follow that animals are imperfect? The holy angels are not what God is; will it be said that they are imperfect? The planets and the stars are inferior to the angels of heaven; clouds often come to cover the sun and the moon like a veil; are these stars less perfect? The members of the body have a mutual need of each other (because the feet cannot do what the hands do); is it a reason to say that they are imperfect? No, no doubt. All created beings have a perfection in relation to the place and rank they occupy and the end for which they are created. They are therefore all perfect because their Creator is perfect, yet compared to the Creator, they are obviously imperfect. The perfection of God extends to everything, because he is the source and the origin of all things. The created beings are perfect, no doubt, but for the end that God has given them by creating them. Considered in another respect, they no longer have this perfection because they need each other. They are perfect in so far as they are sufficient for themselves, and not as they need a foreign aid; they are therefore a mixture of perfection and imperfection. The hands claim the accord of the feet, because if the feet refuse to walk, the hands are without action. The feet in their turn need the hands, because they can neither fit themselves nor take from them the care they demand. The body is therefore perfect

in its limbs, however it can neither fly nor carry such heavy loads as the mule. These animals are themselves perfect, yet they can neither govern themselves nor administer the remedies they need. What made the Psalmist say: "Do not be like the horse and the mule, animals without intelligence." (Ps. 31:9) Water and fire are two incompatible elements, but they are perfect in their kind because they fulfill the purpose for which they are created. The fire cooks and consumes the objects on which it expels its activity, it purifies and warms; water washes, refreshes, sprinkles and quenches thirst. All created objects are therefore perfect in their kind, yet they cannot do anything without man, just as man, though more perfect, cannot do without their help. This is why the Apostle declares that we are imperfect and perfect at the same time. In comparison with the faithful, we are perfect, because we know God, but we are imperfect because we do not have sufficient knowledge of the promises made to us, because as long as we are in this life, we cannot understand in all their extent the truths that are the object of our faith. Now, since there are some who think that the faithful come into possession of the perfection of Adam, let us see if the reparation of man does not open to him a source of graces more abundant than those given to Adam. Adam was placed in a garden to cultivate it and to be its faithful guardian, that is to say, to cultivate the earth and keep the commandments of God which taught him that by receiving the empire over all created objects he lived, however, under the control of his Creator, and that this empire did not owe all pride and make him forget who had created him, he was therefore placed in this garden to support his existence by the food he needs. But by virtue of the grace that Jesus Christ gave to men, after their resurrection, they will no longer need to eat or drink, because that which is mortal in man will then be absorbed by life. Adam was created to dwell on the earth, but faith gives us the singular hope of living one day in heaven. Here is the testimony of Scripture itself: "Adam the first man was created with a living soul; and the second has been filled with a vivifying spirit. The first man is the terrestrial formed of the earth, the second is the heavenly who comes from heaven. As the first man was earthly, his children are also earthly; and as the second is heavenly, his children are also heavenly." (1 Cor. 15:45) Is it not evident from these words that Adam did not receive the Holy Spirit? He has received a living soul, but through Jesus Christ we receive a life-giving spirit, which in a way renders man like the Creator in whom he believes. Indeed, the mystery of the faith that man must believe to be saved is

the mystery of God in three persons, and in man we also see these three things, the body, the soul, and the Holy Spirit, by which we deserve to be called the children of God, a title which was not given to Adam, for he was earthly and formed of the earth. But it is the children of God whose birth is wholly spiritual and not carnal, who deserve to be called heavenly. It is, therefore, well established that God has given to men at the advent of the Savior much greater blessings than Adam had received. Man was not only restored to his former state, he was raised to a more excellent condition; he was restored to his first state, because he was cleansed of his sins; but for all the rest he was raised to a much higher perfection. In fact, justice and reason demanded that the goodness of God should be more abundant in his benefits, while he deigned to reveal to his creature the mystery of his divinity. Men having known what had remained hidden for centuries and generations before, the mystery of God in three persons, it was fitting, to consecrate this new revelation, that with the remission of their sins and justification, they still receive the adoption of the children of God and the Holy Spirit who imprints in them the sign of this adoption. The adoption that comes from God must bear the sign of God the Father so that we may be called justly the children of God. The prophets themselves had predicted that this favor would be given to men when the mystery of God would fail in his triumph over death, so that every creature would recognize that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit were one and the same God. That is why the Evangelist says: "The Spirit was not given yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified." This glorification took place when the manifestation of his power made him recognize for what he was, according to the testimony he had given of himself, because this glorification was the source of the grace promised by the prophet Joel: "In the last days, says God, I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh, etc." (Joel 2:28, etc.) And the Apostle on his side: "When the blessing and the tenderness of God our Savior appeared, he saved us, not because of the works of righteousness that we have done, but by his mercy, by making us reborn by baptism and renewing us by the Holy Spirit whom he has shed abundantly upon us by Jesus Christ our Savior, so that, being justified by His grace, we are heirs, according to the hope of eternal life." (Titus 3:4) The Apostle confirms the prophet Joel's prediction, a prediction that God accomplishes after Jesus was glorified, spreading the Holy Spirit on those who believe in Jesus Christ. However, to receive the Holy Spirit is to become heirs of eternal life, for the Holy Spirit is eternal, and he who receives

it receives eternal life and immortality whose Holy Spirit is the pledge. He who receives it and perseveres in his love after this life enters the heavens to be eternally united with him whose Spirit he has, for it would be neither right nor just that whoever comes out of this life having in him the Holy Spirit, was held in hell. Indeed, the sign in the man of the victory that Jesus Christ has won over death is his Spirit, and he in whom this Spirit finds himself cannot be held captive in the underworld. So the Holy Spirit was not in the saints of the old law as it is today in the faithful. These righteous, at the end of this life, dwelt in hell, and it cannot be said that because of the sin of Adam, which was transmitted by generation to all his descendants, condemned them to this captivity, the Holy Spirit himself even was subject to the sentence of ruling pronounced against Adam. Without a doubt, the Holy Spirit was with the prophets and righteous of the old law; with the prophets for the fulfillment of their ministry; with the righteous because of their holiness, as we read of old Simeon, whose saying is, "The Holy Spirit was in him," (Luke 2:25) not as a sign of divine adoption, but as a principle and as a reward for his merits. The sons of God by faith began only when the Son of God made himself known to all creatures by his triumph over death. If we wish to maintain that the Holy Spirit was in Adam or the other righteous ones of the old law, as he is now in the faithful, what are the new ones in which God made us when he inaugurated among us the kingdom of his Son? And how can one call, blessed and prosperous above all others, the time when the Savior appeared on earth, if he did not pour out upon others other graces than those they had already received? And what do these words of the Savior himself mean to his disciples? "Many prophets and righteous have desired to see what you see and have not seen, hear what you hear and have not heard it?" (Matt. 13:17) By what reason, then, can one say that this blessed time has given men nothing more than what has been granted to the ancients? Such a feeling is injurious to the Savior who would not have given men any new thanks to those who received him to consecrate the birth of his empire. Do the rich of the earth not seek, and at great cost, to give to their guests, on the anniversary of their birth, selected and distinguished presents? It is therefore an insult to God to think that he has made no new and extraordinary grace to those whom he has invited to this great and new solemnity worthy of all the praises of men. Where would be the truth of these words of the Gospel "He came into his domain, and his people did not receive it? As for those who received him, he gave them the power to become

children of God, to those who believe in his name, born neither of the blood nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of the Lord, but who are born of God?" (Jn. 1:11, etc.) How, then, would not God have showered extraordinary graces on those who believed in Jesus Christ, since He gave them the power to become children of God, that is, to say the brethren of his own Son, not from the will of the flesh, nor from man, but from God Himself. If it is claimed that men had already received this precious gift, then the advent of Jesus Christ on earth was for men the principle of no new grace. Adam's creation was carnal and earthly, not spiritual. He was not born of God without the help of flesh and blood, since God made him of earth; He could not, therefore, receive the Holy Spirit, because he was not spiritual, and had not been given to call God his father in prayer. On the contrary, those who have received the Holy Spirit receive at the same time the inseparable power of the Holy Spirit who is in them, to call God in their prayers the father of the Christians. Now, as the righteous of the old law did not have this privilege, they had not received the Holy Spirit either. So those who claim that Adam or the righteous have had the Holy Spirit, do not know the price of the grace that God has given them, and they are unable to render him worthy deeds of grace, since they are filled with his the most precious gifts they say have received nothing more than those who lived under the old law.

### (Genesis 2:7)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 3. CAN IT BE SAID THAT ADAM RECEIVED THE HOLY SPIRIT AFTER GOD HAD GIVEN HIM BEING AND LIFE, BECAUSE IT IS WRITTEN, "GOD BREATHED ON HIS FACE A BREATH OF LIFE?" —** It was not in order that Adam received the Holy Spirit; it was a reserved grace for the end times, and that God was to give to believers in the days when the mystery of one God in three persons was to be announced to men. The Trinity had been preached from the beginning, but the intelligence remained as veiled. The person of the Father was first announced and manifested with complete clarity and without figure, because he is the principle of all things. As for the persons of his Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they were neither the object of absolute

silence nor of complete manifestation. The unbelievers raise reckless questions about Our Lord and the Holy Spirit. there are even those who push the absurdity to the point of maintaining that the Holy Spirit is the same as the Father, just as Sabellius confuses in one person the Father and the Son. There is no doubt against the person of the Father. So when the Trinity manifests itself, the Holy Spirit is given to the faithful, so that the existence of this divine person remains well established, and those who receive it bear in themselves the sign that they are the children of God. God, by the very fact that they have the Spirit of God in them. It is a mark of perfection to know the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It is this perfection that gets us this gift. And then, the Son of God coming to the earth to reveal and discover these truths, had to pour out more abundant graces on men, and it was right that he gives this perfection to the souls who believed in him, for this not in the Son or in the Father, considered in isolation, is salvation, but in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. This is what makes St. John the evangelist say: "And we have all received of his fullness, and grace for grace: for the law was given by Moses, grace and truth came from Jesus Christ." (Jn. 1:16) It is certain that at the advent of the Savior, the truth has come to its fullness. This fullness of truth was produced by the revelation of all the hidden mysteries that God had promised to manifest to men. It was then that the faithful became the children of God through the reception of the Holy Spirit, and the inspiration of God over Adam is to be understood from the soul he gave him because in Scripture the mind is frequently used for the soul, especially in this passage of the Gospel: "And her spirit returned to her," (Luke 8:55) and in the Psalm: "God does not despise a spirit broken by pain and a contrite and humiliated heart." (Ps. 50:19) frequently found in some manuscripts, instead of God inspired, this other variant: "God poured on his face a breath of life, and the man had a living soul." The spirit of life in the thought of the sacred author is therefore not synonymous with the Holy Spirit, for he says also in speaking of animals: "Who had the spirit of life." (Gen. 7:22) But it is called the spirit of life, because it is for the bodies a principle of life.

**(Gen. 2:15-17)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 4. WHY DID GOD IMPOSE UPON ADAM THAT HE HAD PLACED IN THE WORLD A COMMANDMENT, A LAW, AFTER HAVING GIVEN HIM DOMINION OVER ALL CREATURES?** — God had doubtless established Adam the master of the world; but as this empire did not come from himself, but from God, he had to receive a law which was a mark of his dependence, so that the man who appeared to be the master of the world was subject to the one who had given him this empire by his obedience to this law, which gave him a profound respect for the authority of the Creator, and prevented the pride which this domination and the forgetting of his divine Creator might inspire him.

**(Genesis 3)**

**QUESTION 127. THE SIN OF ADAM AND EVE.** — It is no doubt, no doubt, that this world was created for man; although it is composed of varied substances, it nevertheless forms but one body having several members, the combined action of which is intended to produce all the things necessary to man. It was like a house built for man with the provisions he needed, provisions that the earth had to produce each according to its kind, that is to say, that by the fact of their creation they had been able to reproduce each according to its species. God created the primitive types whose seed was to serve in turn the multiplication of species on earth. This is the result of these words of the Scripture: "And God blessed them, saying, Be multiplied and multiply on earth (Gen. 1:28)." He also blesses the human race, and we see the same meaning reproduced in the book of the law. We read in it: "The people grew and multiplied in Egypt (Acts 7:17)." The blessing which God had given to the things he had created for the benefit of man was also given to man, so that mankind grew and multiplied the union of man and woman. And just as culture had to improve the seeds, so the human race had to do all its care so that the knowledge of God would help her to lead her life, to render pleasing to God and to relate all things to admiration and praise the glory of his Creator.

Whether it is the meaning of these words, the facts themselves attest, for all things which have been created multiply and improve upon the earth by the will of God. Indeed, one cannot suppose any other mode of development than that which God has established for his seeds. How, then, can we attribute an evil origin, or an illicit character, to that which develops only under the influence of the blessings of God and of his will? The tradition of this blessing has always remained in the synagogue and is still in use today in the Church which consecrates by the blessing of God the union of its creatures. And there is no presumption here on his part since the form of this blessing comes from the Creator himself. If it is thought that this blessing must cease one day, it can only be when the things which multiply under this blessing cease to exist, for if the generation of men ceases, what would be the usefulness of creatures who have received the blessing of God to multiply on the earth? The world cannot be partly in action, partly in rest; or it acts wholly, or it remains wholly in rest. What utility would be a body, some of whose members would have life, while others would be struck with apathy? How then do some go so far as to represent as profane and unclean the work which has been consecrated by the blessing of God, except that they wish to attack God Himself? They would find nothing to be recaptured in the work if the false and evil ideas of the artisan were not formed. They do not dare openly to God, they find the means of accusing him in his works. When the work displeases, the blame falls on its author. If these critical spirits read or rather received the Scriptures, they would recall the saying of Balaam: "Can I curse him whom God has blessed (Num. 23:8)?" There is no charge against the approval of the judge, and one condemns oneself when one wants to accuse as guilty the one whom the laws themselves protect. Who, then, are you who believe that you can condemn what God has blessed as the Scriptures teach you? You must either deny that he is God, or that you should be contrary to Scripture. Indeed, it is under the pretext that they receive the New Testament that they ought to reject the ancient Scriptures. Now the new precepts which Jesus Christ imposes on the faithful are not in contradiction with the ancients. The Savior himself has not disdained to reply to the invitation which he was made to attend a wedding; and not only did he honor them with his presence, but he even gave the spouses what was lacking in the joy of the feast (Jn. 2:1), for it is written that wine rejoices the heart of man (Ps. 103:15). And to show that he did nothing but the will of his Father, the Jews having asked him whether it was permissible for a man to

return his father, He said to them, "From the beginning of the world God made man and woman, and said unto them, For this cause a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh (Matt. 19:3-6). Therefore they are no longer two, but one flesh. So let not man separate what God adds. This was why he gladly surrendered to the invitation to attend the meetings, he would not appear to condemn what God his Father had instituted. Wishing, on the contrary, to show the harmony of the old law and of the new law, he not only did not proscribe marriage, but deigned to honor it by his presence, to render him the testimony of his divine institution, and by a most salutary commandment declared that they should neither defend nor separate what God had united. It is also to raise the utility of the birth of man, that on the point of leaving this world, he confided his mother to his disciple John (Jn. 19:26). It is for the same reason that the precepts of the old law and of the new law agree to recommend that we honor our parents under pain of curses if we breach this commandment. What then is this presumption, and on what law is it based to proscribe the marriage so clearly authorized by the old as by the new law? We may apply to him these words of the Savior: "That which is without is from evil (Matt. 5:37)." Thus the Apostle reproaches himself with having a cauterized conscience to those men who forbid marriage, and the use of the foods that God created to be eaten with actions of graces. (I Tim. 4:2.) It is an act on their part, both of hypocrisy and of hostility, whose object is to accuse the law of which God is the author. Others seem to receive the precepts of salvation with eagerness only to support the prescriptions of their doctrine of falsehood, and this is why the Apostle reproaches them for having a closed conscience. Indeed, the corruption of their hearts makes them manifest outside feelings different from what they think internally: they resemble the Jews who knew that the miracles of the Savior were works of the Holy Spirit and that they did not say a feeling of jealousy that it was in the name of Beelzebub that he cast out demons (Matt. 12:24, Lk. 11:15), to divert the people from believing in him. Such is also the deceit of those of whom we have spoken; in the name of the holiness and chastity with which they boast of being the partisans, they maintain that marriage must be condemned, seeking to make itself valued and to divert the people from truth; It is thus also that they recommend the abstinence of certain foods to give themselves falsely as models of temperance which, strangers to the world, hasten to reach the kingdom of heaven. After they have thus seduced

the spirits of men, they preach the legitimacy of the most reprehensible acts and condemn the use of permissible things. Such are the wiles of Satan, he inverts the roles and in the form of a novelty he excludes truth which is nothing new because it is wholly eternal. Who does not notice that such is the conduct adopted by our enemies? Who, moreover, would dare to condemn a divine institution which has never been injurious to anyone but the enemy of truth? In order to cover his disorders, he preaches the sanctity which he dislikes, and when he has thus become a zealous supporter of good, he teaches that the most culpable acts are permitted. It makes itself worth to deceive more easily and to suggest to the imprudent ones who fall into its traps more enormous sins. It is a remedy, it seems to his own evils, to incite men to excess crimes; he regards it as a great consolation to have many accomplices, and regards his punishment as lighter and more tolerable if he succeeds in drawing a large number with him into hell blind men who are overcome by their vices excuse themselves for their weakness or ignorance, and do not think of punishing the faults on which concupiscence deceives them. Or what is this cloud that conceals from them the knowledge of truth? For the letters appear to have a different signification, when they are badly pronounced, or are not properly distinguished; but when one reads: God has done, and again: God has blessed what he has done, can it remain matter either to the discussion or to the slightest doubt? Who will dare to see the curse instead of the blessing, unless animated by a hostile spirit? If these words were the words of man, perhaps one might fear some ploy, but it is God who speaks, and you doubt? It is God blessed, and you condemn? But was not Moses under the name of God the author of this error? The miracles and wonders which Moses made in Egypt are an answer to this question, and the wonders he has done in the Red Sea for the deliverance of the children of Israel must suffice to persuade you. Listen to the confession made by the magicians: "The finger of God is here (Exod. 8:19)." Believe in the testimony of the Apostle, who said to you, "I do not want you to be ignorant, my brothers, that our fathers were all under the cloud, that they all passed through and they were all baptized under the guidance of Moses in the cloud and in the sea, that they all ate the same mysterious meat, and that they drank the same mysterious drink, for they drank the water of the spiritual stone, the water which followed them, and this stone was Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 10:1, 4)." And how did the Apostle speak in this way? The answer is in the Scriptures, where we read that Our Lord Jesus Christ

said to the Jews, "If you believed in Moses, you would doubtless believe me too, for it is from me that he wrote (Jn. 5:46)." Who could not believe in such a beautiful harmony, who would dare to see contradiction in such a perfect unity, who would be badly inspired to accuse of hostility so close a union? The testimony of the words, and the examples of the miracles which must submit your mind to the truth, and prevent you from considering as true any doctrine which is not contained in the books of the Catholic Church of the Old Testament is the same as ours, and that a thousand brilliant signs proclaim that it is the only true one, its authority must be so great to us that even if a thing should appear to us too harsh or even absurd, accept, reform on this our personal ideas before the judgment of God who apprehends it, for we must believe in God rather than ourselves. Indeed, our weakness and inexperience often regard as useful what is most injurious to us, and takes the false for truth, which we cannot even suspect of God; its nature is inaccessible to error; it is not permissible for us to doubt the legitimacy of marriage before these words of God: "Let not man divide what God has united (Matt. 19:6: Mk. 10:9)." This is a thing as clear as it is simple. It is certain that every man has reason to rejoice at having been the object of the goodness of God, and that he thinks he is better when he learns to know the sacrament of his Creator, which he would not be able to achieve if he had not been born. Why, then, deplore what makes the subject of his joy, and condemn what he glories of having learned? If he rejoices at having learned, and if, moreover, he could not learn unless he was born; no doubt it is good to be born, since the fruit of birth is the knowledge of the truth. If, on the contrary, it is an evil to be born, knowledge cannot be good. To what purpose can this knowledge be used if the birth is condemned? If it is neither useful nor necessary to be born, why should he who is condemned seek to learn? But as there is no mind stupid enough to deny that knowledge of God is useful to men, it is necessary to recognize its goodness, its utility. It is she who adds a new perfection to birth, so that she deserves more than Adam had received, for it is in heaven and not on earth that the faithful are called to reign, the paradise of God the Father, and not in that where Adam had been ordered to engage in bodily labor. In Jerusalem there was celebrated the feast called encaenia, that is to say, the dedication of the temple of God, how much more must we celebrate the birth of man, who is much more appropriately called the temple of God, and who has himself constructed with his hands to God the temples to give him thanksgiving?

Our body is a much more excellent temple, because it is the work of God, and the material temples are the work of man, that one has the hope of eternity, while the others are destined for a certain ruin. He who acknowledges that it was God who gave birth to him to give thanks, and who has come to know his mysteries, must rejoice on the anniversary of his birth by seeing the precious fruits which he has produced. As for those who abandon their Creator and offer to others the glory which is due to them, it would have been better for them never to be born, for their birth can only turn to their misfortune, and yet the fault is not with birth, but to their will. But who are you, you who pretend to forbid marriage? You may be, Marcion, who maintain that the body is not the work of God but of the devil, and that it is in consequence of some fault that the soul fell from its first state descended into this region of darkness where the world is. Now how could it attain its deliverance if the generation is forbidden to it? It is after your birth that you experienced your downfall and that you have taken the means to return to the fatherland and resume your original destiny. You give thanks to Jesus Christ, by whom you are glad to have obtained this knowledge. Now, if you were not born, all knowledge would have been impossible, and consequently all deliverance. If you rejoice in the deliverance of your soul, be favorable to your birth, for if you condemn it, you are the enemy of souls. Or are you a Manichean, who rejects the marriages as evil? I will then ask you if there was no generation of bodies, how could the soul, which you say is spread in a dark region and closely united to the material elements, be delivered? The book you wrote say that it is by birth that the soul is delivered, that is to say that the souls received by the moon are coming out of their bodies transmitted to the sun which you claim to be the God of your souls. And is it not fortunate for you to bear the name of Manicheans? Indeed, it is in this capacity that you solicit your deliverance, which you would not know if you were not born. It is therefore evident that you condemn marriage by hypocrisy. You make an outward profession of chastity, and you give yourself up in secret to all kinds of impurities, which have not been hidden, but which have been revealed by the very edicts of the emperors. Listen now, you who are a Catholic, and learn from the Gospel how useful it is to the man of valor. When the righteous Simeon wished to leave this life, convinced that it was enough for him to know his Creator without knowing the mystery of his incarnation, God did not accede to his desire until he had arrived at this perfect state for to obtain the full and entire reward of his faith.

It was then that he took in his arms the Savior who had just been born and blessed God in these terms: "Lord, you will now let your servant go in peace according to your word, for my eyes have seen your salvation (Lk. 2:29)." It was clear to God that it was good for man to be born, since it was answered to that righteous man who desired death that he would not die before he had seen the Christ of the Lord; for he had made such great progress here below, that he was worthy to see in this life the man he hoped for as his deliverer after his death. Now, how can we say that birth was not a useful thing for this man to whom God extended his life and allowed him to die only when he had seen the fruit of his hope, and which he would be sure to see for himself life to succeed him? If it were an evil for us to be born, it is neither paradise, nor eternal life, nor the kingdom of heaven promised us, but the punishments and chastisements of hell that we should expect. The man who knew that he was born for his loss would fear to transmit life to another, and he who knew that his birth was a guilty act would not seek to revive in his children. They will say to me, "Yes, the kingdom of heaven is promised, but to the faithful men who have done good." Perfectly, therefore, you see that men are not guilty by the sole fact of their birth, but because they have done evil; for it is not to those who are not born that the kingdom of heaven is promised, which would make birth a cause of exclusion, but to those who after their birth do good; that is to say, birth cannot be useful to the child he that does evil, and hurts him that does good. The faithful and the good men add to the perfection of their birth, the infidels and the unbelievers make their lose her. Birth is like a tree that is grafted; if the graft is good, the tree will become better and be called a good tree; if the graft is bad, it will become worse than it was and deserve to be called a bad tree. Thus, if a sound doctrine is joined at birth, it will produce good fruits, but if the doctrine is bad, the fruits will be equally bad. Just as the tree must exist beforehand so that it can be grafted, birth is also necessary in order to make progress good. But we are made of this body: If it is good and useful to be born, why do we need to be reborn? This rebirth would not take place if birth was not useful. The soul is to be renewed, and those that are renewed are completely repaired. This rebirth is not, therefore, opposed to birth, it is reform, and what is reformed proves by the same the perfection of its first state. This rebirth is a transformation which is the effect of a voluntary resolution, and which purifies the defilements of the body to restore us to the primitive state in which Adam was created. The soul has communicated to

the body the defilements of his sin, but faith repairs it, renders it more perfect and cleanses it in the waters of baptism; the contempt of God had tainted him, obedience purified him, he thus avoided the sentence pronounced against Adam and acquired the right to the glorious resurrection. If, then, it is by the soul that sin began, why should we accuse the nature of the body, since in the sin of Adam it is not the body that has desired, but the soul seduced by hope of the divinity, who transgressed the precept, cast the body into the bondage of sin, and condemned all men to be born slaves to sin? Now this sin does not harm the man who obeys the law of God, except that he is subject to death; but here again the goodness of God has promised him a reward proportionate with that punishment, that is, those who will be found faithful to their Creator, and whom the sins of Adam condemn to corruption and death, will receive in return from the righteous judge more than God had granted to Adam; they will be covered with glory in heaven and will possess eternal life, and will be called the adopted sons of God, so that it is truly a gain for them to be born. I now follow the passage from which we read: "God said to man, You may eat of all the fruit of the garden, but you do not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 2:16-17)." All the trees of which God speaks here are the fruits destined to be made the food of the creatures. They are given here the general name of trees, but there is a great variety in the fruits. They are all, however, trees and plants, and there is only one kind of food in spite of the diversity of fruits used to the food of man. When God had created this multitude of fruit trees for the nourishment of man, he forbade him, as I have said, to eat the fruit of a single tree. As our first parents had been empowered over all things, it was fitting that they should give God on one point a testimony of submission and respect. He had therefore reserved a single tree to which he had forbidden them to touch, to remind them of their condition. How can the sentence pronounced against them make us understand what was the nature of their fault? This sentence, in fact, can be pronounced both against a homicide, against a malefactor, an adulteress, an infamous one. (Josh. 17:1, etc.). How, then, to judge according to this sentence of the nature of sin, is to be condemned after his sin to be consumed by fire, and all his family. It can be assumed that sin was great, but not what its nature was, for we know that others were condemned to the same punishment, although their fault was different. Amorites and the inhabitants of Sodom perished, and their children, and we see men guilty of the same crime, punished with various punishments, with

one and the same sentence pronounced against those whose crimes are quite different, and of Eve cannot be known by the sentence pronounced against them. The sin of man and woman is the same, it is true, yet both were condemned to a particular and individual punishment, as was the serpent. Not only did they not preserve the prerogatives of their former state, but God imposed upon them labor as the punishment of their crime. God, as the book of Genesis tells us, had subjected all animals and all living beings to man (Gen. 1:26). The serpent rose up against this order, and so much by his cunning and his artifices that he enslaved man to his empire. No doubt, indeed, he who makes someone fall into his traps, submits him to his dominion. But God did not wish that he should receive the fruits of his deceit; he humbled and shamed him below his first condition, that he might not rise above man, leaves him only the pain, not only of not having succeeded in his designs, but of having lost the perfection of his creation. It was, says the sacred author, the most of all the animals God had placed on earth; but after he had deceived the man, he was cursed among all the beasts and creatures of the earth. After the sentence pronounced against man, against woman, against the serpent, the woman, who had been the accomplice of man in contempt of the divine command, was to be subjected to a particular punishment. God said to her, "I will multiply your calamities, your childbirth, you will give birth in sorrow, your desires will turn to your husband, and he will rule over you (Gen. 3:16.)." No one confirms himself what he condemns. If children were granted to the woman because she had united herself to the man against the order of God, then a guilty act must be recognized as having wonderful effects. But if you believe that the principle of the generation of men is in these words: "You will be grieved in sorrow," what did these words mean: "Increase and multiply"? This sentence, "Ye shall bear in sorrow," is therefore only a punishment, that is to say, that what had previously been granted to him as a cause of joy will become a sin source of sorrows; and that this punishment should cease to weigh upon the woman, God adds that her desires will turn to her husband, and will be for her a principle of ever-new sorrows. If God condemned the union of man and woman, why did he say to her: "Will your desires turn to your husband?" No one establishes as punishment what he condemns as reprehensible, since punishment must always be opposed to the crime he punishes, and that it must come from a very different principle. If the fault and the punishment come from the same principle, no one

would be afraid of being condemned. One might even say that the transgression of the law becomes a laudable act. Far from punishing sin, God would have confirmed it, if the desires of the woman had turned to her husband only because of her sin. But no, the truth is that this union of woman with man, which had been merely permissible before sin, was then imposed upon her with the bondage of childbirth as a punishment, because man had been left to rule by the woman whom God had given her as companion. It is evident that he had been subject by the woman whose counsels had led her to believe in the hopes she had given him, and which were intended only to destroy the work of God by the ploys of the devil. God, by his sentence, therefore returns the wife to the condition of subjugation which subjects her to her husband, according to the first institution, and adds, as a punishment: "I will multiply your calamities and your movements; you will turn to your husband, and he will rule over you." Had God established the woman in a state which was not a state of submission to her husband? The woman is therefore recalled here to this first state with the addition we have pointed out. That is why God said to her, "I will set the height of your sorrows and your groans." Putting the end is adding to what is incomplete, not establishing or doing what does not. The words of God that precede: "Rise and multiply," (Gen. 1:22, 28) are not for creation but for the loss of creatures to whom God conceded existence. After sin, God adds to the pain and difficulties of woman's birth, but does not establish a new form of procreation. If these words have really been the principle of generation, it must be attributed rather to the will of the devil than to that of the Lord, for there is, as the Savior declares, a race of vipers. (Matt. 3:7) Now, if anyone thinks he was born in this way, let him consider what he deserved. It was because of her sin that she saw the pangs of childbirth increase, and that this grief, which was at first slight, increased in punishment for the sins of her children; for it is in the groans and tears that she gives birth to them, and scarcely have they been born, that they become for her a permanent cause of sadness. Thirdly, let us see the sentence pronounced against the man: "Because you have listened to your wife's voice, and have eaten the fruit of the tree which I have forbidden you to eat, the earth will be cursed because of what you have done, and you will not eat of its fruits, in all the days of your life but with great labor, it will produce for you only thorns and thistles (Gen. 3:17-18)." Adam is also recalled to the state in which he was created, but with a decrease of his privileges. God had first placed him in the earthly paradise to simply

cultivate the earth and see at once the fruit of his work. But scarcely has he despised the divine commandment, in the hope of finding in the council of the serpent a fate more fortunate than that which God had given him, God recalls him to his first condition, but by adding to it sweat and fatigue; the earth will no longer respond to his labors, it will be cursed not for it, but because of its works. God thus shows that His designs cannot be destroyed and that no one can show greater providence. No one, in fact, can love the work of another more strongly than the one who is the author of it, to the apostle's testimony: "Never has anyone hated his own flesh; nourishes and cares for her, like Jesus Christ the Church (Eph. 5:29)." Let us now see whether the continuation of the historical facts of the law agrees with its beginnings. Abraham having been pleasing to God, among other rewards of his faith, was judged worthy to beget a son in his old age. How, then, can we attack and condemn what God grants as a reward? That is to say, that Abraham having obeyed the divine will, sees God fulfill his own will, which could not have been done if this will was not innocent, for God would not have granted a request or bad or unintelligent, especially in with respect to him who was pleasing to him; a man himself would not act in this way. A man who was barren and loved God with all his heart, asked for a son and obtained it. Now, if this request were guilty, the God whom he loved should have warned him not to make a request contrary to the good. (I Kgs. 1:2) Samuel, his son, of such eminent sanctity, had children in his turn, but the merit of his justice was not diminished. On the contrary, his virtue never ceased to increase since his first years, and he received from God in his old age the most striking testimony. The priest Zechariah, a righteous man, also had in his old age, by the will of God, a son who had the gift of prophecy even before his birth (Lk. 1:5). What is the reason why we are accused of what everyone agrees to present as advantageous? How can one deny that one must call good and useful something that does not harm anyone? And to speak here a little of the apostles and to make them serve for the direct defense of this cause, St. John was certainly a faithful observer of chastity; but we know that his colleague in the apostolate, that is, St. Peter, had a wife, and that the children she gave him were not an obstacle to the primacy he received from the other apostles. How then can we condemn what can be reconciled with the greatest merits? Thus the apostle St. Paul teaches that he who has a wife, if he observes the commandments, can and must be raised to the priesthood. If marriage were unlawful, he would not have declared that a

sinner should receive the priesthood. And what is more evident? Is it not the same Apostle who says: "As for the virgins, I have not received a commandment from the Lord (1 Cor. 7:25)?" The heretics notice trouble and agitation among the Corinthians, by hypocritically teaching that marriage should be condemned; they therefore consulted the Apostle by letters, to ascertain whether it was lawful to marry, or whether to send his wife away. It is then that St. Paul commands the woman not to separate herself from her husband, although it would have been the occasion, if he had been convinced that this was the true doctrine, to say that it was forbidden to marry, just as he declares that he cannot impose as a precept what he has received no command from the Lord. Who, on the contrary, does not hear him preach loudly: 'I want young widows to marry and have children?' But, I am told, if it is lawful, if it is advantageous to marry, why is it not permissible for priests to have their wives, that is to say, why is it forbidden for them to have relations with her after their ordination? Who knows that each state has its own laws? There are things that are generally prohibited at all; there are some who are permitted to one and forbidden to others; there are some which are sometimes defended and sometimes permitted. Fornication is forbidden to all without exception; but trade is sometimes permitted and sometimes defended. Before entering the ecclesiastical state, a man is permitted to trade, but he can no longer do so as soon as he is a part of it. In the same way, it is sometimes permissible, sometimes forbidden for a Christian to have relations with his wife. Thus, in the days of public supplication, it is his duty to separate from his wife, because he must abstain even from the things permitted to obtain more easily what he asks of God. For this reason the Apostle recommends abstaining for one time from the use of the marriage of the consent of one and the other, in order to attend to prayer. According to the law, wars and lawsuits are prohibited on fasting days, and are permitted on other days to show greater respect for the things of God. Is all that is permitted before other men equally before the person of the sovereign? How much more must we observe this rule in the things of God? The priest consecrated to him must therefore be purer than other men; he represents him, he is his vicar, and what is permitted to others is forbidden to him, because he must fulfill every day the functions of Jesus Christ himself, that is to say pray for the people, offer the sacrifice, or administer baptism. It is not only to the priest that the use of marriage is forbidden, but also to his minister, for he must be all the purer as the mysteries of which he is the

minister are more holy. Just as in the presence of a torch darkness appears not only obscure, but hideous, as compared with the stars the flame itself loses its brightness, the stars compared to the sun become dark, the sun compared to God is more than a dark night; thus things which are lawful and pure to us become illicit and impure in the presence of the dignity of God, for all the good they are, they are not suitable to the divine majesty. Would not the tunic of an obscure man, no matter how clean, be a scoundrel unbecoming the person of the emperor? Is it not the same with the tunic of the Saxons for a senator? For the same reason the priests of God must be more chaste than other men, because they represent the person of Jesus Christ, and the purity of the ministers of God must be greater. Nobody comes to fulfill his office near the emperor, except in a perfectly neat exterior, with clothes of brilliant cleanliness. Now, God, who by his nature is light itself, demands that his ministers be pure in their conscience rather than in their garments; to him praise and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

### (Genesis 3:1)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 31. IS IT TRUE THAT IT WAS A SERPENT WHO SPOKE WITH THE WOMAN, OR IS IT THE VERY ACT OF THE DEVIL WHO HAS SEDUCED HER, WHO HAS GIVEN HER THE NAME OF SERPENT? —** If we keep to the historical narrative, it is true that the serpent was the finest of all the animals that the Lord God had formed on earth. Besides, it is against the serpent that God has pronounced his sentence. What, indeed, would it be astonishing that the devil was finer than the animals, the Apostle of whom said, "Do you not know the depths of Satan (2 Cor. 2:11)?" Another proof that it was a true serpent is that God said to him, "You shall crawl on your stomach, and you shall eat of the earth all the days of your life (Gen. 3:14)." This punishment is in no way suited to the nature of Satan, since he is neither clothed in body nor subject to death. If we examine things more closely, we shall see that this sentence did not aggravate the condition of the serpent, and that it was condemned to remain in the state in which God had created it. He had been the instrument of Satan to subdue the man to

whom God had subjected everything; for this reason God represses the pride of the serpent by that subjugation in which he had placed all creatures before man, because he had been a minister of pride to man. The man appeared to have submitted to the serpent, following the advice which he gave him of transgressing the law which he had imposed upon him. The Lord Himself testifies to the prudence of serpents, when he says, "Be careful as serpents (Matt. 10:16)." It is therefore well established that the serpent truly spoke with Eve; it now remains for us to examine whether he has been sufficiently sly and cunning enough to deceive her. For if it were finer than other animals, it could be no more than men, since no animal is endowed with reason, except man. It is impossible, therefore, that the serpent should be the author of these subtle insinuations; let him be in good health, but his finesse cannot go beyond his nature. It cannot deliberate, reflect, or take advice. It is therefore certain that it was the devil, who in the form of the serpent, sought to seduce the woman. By slipping into the form of the serpent, he used it as an instrument, so that the woman, who knew the serpent's fineness, could not suspect the cunning of the demon hiding in this form. Hence the sentence of condemnation carried out against the serpent, falls spiritually upon Satan, because the sentence must reach the true culprit. This sentence does not come from man, who by error or malice might condemn an innocent man; it comes from God who is infallible, and whose judgment reaches only the one guilty. Satan, though invisible, makes his snares outwardly; the sentence of condemnation is pronounced externally, but it falls spiritually upon him whose crime has necessitated the sentence. Indeed, Satan, that audacious and impure spirit, has been thrown from the sacred dwelling of heaven and condemned to crawl and groan on earth. I may be asked in what language the serpent spoke to the woman; I answer, in the language of the serpent. If there are any, who now understand the signification of the barking of dogs, the howling of wolves, the cries of elephants, the chanting of cocks, why the woman who then had no less intelligence, could not she have understood the snake's throat, when we know many who understand the signification of the song of the birds? It is certain that the devil used the tongue of the one in whose body he had entered, otherwise he could not have deceived the woman. He therefore spoke the language of the serpent which he had chosen as his instrument.

**(Genesis 3:7-9)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 19. WAS ADAM'S BODY, WHEN IT WAS CREATED, IMMORTAL OR SUBJECT TO DEATH?** — God in creating man had given him the privilege of immortality supposed that he would not sin. He had to be for himself the author of life or death. If he avoided sin, he would enjoy immortality as the fruit of his labor; but if he was unfaithful to his duty, he could only blame himself for being subject to death. As long as he persevered in obedience to the Creator's mind, he was worthy to feed on the fruit of the tree of life, which preserved him from death; for his body was not by its nature immune to dissolution, it was the virtue of the tree of life which preserved it from corruption. I will say that even after sin he could have remained incorruptible if it had been allowed to eat from the tree of life. But how to admit an immortal body for whom food is a necessary support? An immortal being does not need to eat or drink. Food gave him strength, but the tree of life, by a kind of medicinal virtue, removed from him any element of corruption. Thus, it was for man an impenetrable wall to death.

**(Genesis 4:1-18)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 5. WHY WAS THE SACRIFICE OF ABEL APPROVED OF GOD, AND THAT OF CAIN REFUSED?** — One can conclude from the terms alone of this narrative that the truth of history is not veiled by any literary artifice. The Holy Scripture tells us here clearly that Abel was prudent and religious, while Cain was negligent and careless, and by the same had much less religion. Abel therefore chooses the best sheep of his flock to offer them to his Creator. By offering God the first fruits of the possessions he had made, he testified of God's excellence and deep submission, he testified his feelings of respect and adoration, and acknowledged that God was the author of all things. Cain, guided by coarser sentiments, could not offer God a similar sacrifice. When he was plunged into the things of the earth, he could not raise the eyes of his soul to heaven to consider

what might be worthy of his Creator, and he offered to God the most common fruits of the earth. It is in this also that the Jews lacked righteousness. For the Lord has often reproached them that they are inconsiderately charging on his altar victims even unworthy of being offered to men. "You offer me," said he, "sightless or blind victims, I will not receive them from your hands; Offer them to your master or chief if they please him. (Mal. 1:8)" Everyone agrees, indeed, that one must offer what is most excellent to a person of higher dignity. The Lord therefore rejected Cain's gifts and said to him, "Why are you angry and why is your face sad? If you do your offering with righteousness, but you do not have it in the choice of your gifts, you sin. Stay at rest. Your offering comes to you and you are the master of it. (Gen. 4:6). You see that it was the choice of the gift which rendered it, usable. He was not able to discern what was worthy of God, and reserved the best fruits for his use. It is not therefore the offering he has made that God reproaches Cain, but the unworthy presents he offers him. And he is not even condemned for this fact, but because in spite of this warning he would not correct his conduct. "This offering comes to you, and you are the master of it," (Ibid., 7), that is, those gifts that I reject become your property again. He wants to teach him what to do in the future. Cain conceived a violent jealousy against his brother. This man of iniquity put to death the first righteous man, and thus gave men the example of crime. In fact, this profound jealousy blinded him to the point that not only did he not give thanks to God, who, far from punishing him as guilty, taught him to correct his conduct, but that he fell into a far more enormous crime which attracted his just condemnation. The imprudent conduct of the Cain fratricide resembles that of that wretched servant, who, ungrateful for the forgiveness he had just received from his master, wanted to acquit his companion, and thus deserved to be condemned without excuse, and for the fault which had been forgiven him, and for his cruelty to his fellowman (Matt. 18:28). Nevertheless, Cain was not condemned at once; he was left on earth to be confounded and terrified by his crime, and to facilitate the way of repentance and forgiveness. And as he was afraid of being put to death for the crime he had committed, he said to the Lord, "*My iniquity is too great for me to be forsaken; If you reject me today from the face of the earth, I will escape from all eyes, I will be wandering and groaning on earth, and whoever finds me will kill me* (Gen. 4:13). Cain, afraid of the condemnation of the just Judge, fears that this abandonment of the Lord forces him to flee the eyes of men,

certain that it is that he who has against him an angry God must fear to be put to death by the men. But what does the Lord answer? "It will not be so," said he, "that is to say, I will not let you go, you who do not deserve to live, that you may fall under the blows of your likes, but so that you may spend your life in groans, in fear, and in alarms, as a punishment for the evil example which you first gave on earth, and seeing that the earth does not respond by your productiveness to your labors. *He*, he adds, *who will kill Cain will be punished seven times* (Gen. 4:24). This sentence proves the justice of Cain's condemnation. When he saw this law given with that threatening sanction which forbade imitation of his criminal conduct, he knew the whole extent of the crime he had committed, and his fears increased. God threatens to punish seven times as great a punishment, so that by understanding how great the crime of Cain was before the promulgation of a positive law, he knew that he was incurring punishment seven times more severe if he was guilty of it, that is to say that knowledge of the law would add six degrees more to the punishment which Cain had deserved, and that this punishment would be literally sevenfold. This same number also represents the reward of those who have left everything to follow the Lord, and who, in addition, will receive eternal life in the other world. This is the sign that the Lord put on Cain, *so that whoever would find him would not do so* (Ibid. 15). By virtue of this law which has been brought against the murderer, every man who has committed a murder, because all murder is a homicide, would be seven times more guilty than Cain. God wanted the fear of such severe punishment to stop those who would be tempted to commit such a crime.

#### (Genesis 4:23)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 6. DID LAMECH KILL CAIN, AS SOME THINK?** — It is a false opinion based on what Lamech says of Cain, *I killed a man who hurt me, a young man who covered me with wounds*. For Lamech was born of the fifth generation after Cain, that is, of Methuselah, the great grandson of Cain. Lamech recalls this fact to show that a much more rigorous punishment was reserved for those who would bound since the promulgation of the law. If, then, after Cain, the punishment

has been sevenfold for the imitator of his crime, how much more severe will this chastisement be for that which neither the crime of Cain nor the severe reproaches addressed to him, nor the sentence pronounced against him may have diverted from a crime in which impiety is joined to cruelty. Lamech has committed this homicide after Cain, and without a doubt, from what we have said. His punishment was seven times more severe. Now what will happen to him who, after Lamech, will follow his example? He tells us by saying, *I will avenge the death of Lamech seventy times seven times* (Gen. 4:24). If this criminal action is not followed by repentance, it will be punished with a punishment seventy times seven times more terrible. That is why Our Lord commands to forgive him who has sinned this same number of times, if he regrets his faults. (Matt. 18:22) But it must not be believed that another homicide was committed before that of Lamech and after that of Cain, because Lamech says, *The murder of Cain was avenged* (Gen. 4:24 LXX), as if this vengeance was done. As for Lamech, how could he have said that he had already been the object of this vengeance, whereas the murder he confessed to have committed was still recent? It may therefore be said that every crime carries with it its condemnation. For when there is no other hope, besides that one knows what is worth an act which is consummated, one considers as already done a thing which is yet to be done. Finally, it was said to Adam and Eve: *The day that you eat of this fruit, you shall die of death* (Gen. 2:17), and yet they did not die immediately, but after a long interval of time. However, since they had already lost the hope of immortality, death, which was not to strike them until later, was, so to speak, present to them, because it was then the object of their fears. When, therefore, Lamech confesses to having killed a young man, since it is certain that Cain could not live until that time, or that if his life has been prolonged until then, what seems impossible is then an old man, it is not him that Lamech killed.

### (Genesis 6:3)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 5. WHY DOES GOD EXPRESS HIMSELF IN THIS WAY: “MY SPIRIT WILL NOT REMAIN IN MEN, BECAUSE THEY ARE FLESH,**

**AND THEIR DAYS WILL BE BUT A HUNDRED AND TWENTY YEARS.** — The giants who were then on the earth, superb and malicious men, proud of the magnitude of their size, obedient to the desires of their flesh, and apostates from birth, displeased sovereignly with God. It was then that he declared that mankind would perish by the deluge, and he set the time for it to allow time for correction to those whom the just threats of his indignation would touch with repentance. It is for this reason that the construction of this ark lasted a hundred years. Twenty years passed before Noah began to build it. But the narration seems to cast darkness over what it adds after talking about Noah's years. The judgment of God was made before Noah had reached the age of five hundred years. What does he say, in effect: "My Spirit will not abide in these men," and he adds, "Because iniquity has increased on the earth, I will destroy from off the earth, from man to man, to the animals," (Gen. 6:3) prediction that the flood was charged to fulfill, and we know that after the flood the life of men was prolonged for many years, Aaron, brother of Moses lived one hundred and twenty-three years, but Moses did not live beyond a hundred and twenty years, because he did not glorify God in the water of contradiction, (Num. 33:38) for without this sin of defiance he would have entered the promised land. (Num. 27:14) Some believe that the fact of the high priest Jehoiada, who lived a hundred and thirty years, relates to the time of Moses. (2 Chron. 24:15)

**(Genesis 11:14-21).**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 108. OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE, WHERE DOES ITS NAME COME FROM.** — Everything that comes from God is reasonable, and everything has its source in a cause which is the principle of its origin, which justifies its name and its existence in the eyes of reason, and presents a designation which is the origin of the name that it is clothed. The reason for existence of man is therefore the cause by which it exists. Now it is composed of four elements, the earth, the air, the water and the fire; the fifth element is the soul, which is like the conductor and as the king destined to direct the body after its formation and organization. We

derive our origin from the earth, and we bear its name. In fact, the name of men given to us comes from humus, earth, of which the body of our first father was formed. There is, therefore, here a cause, a reason for all those who derive their origin from the same father, to be called by the same name, and seem to reproduce it in themselves. Let us now see whether it is right to say as some, that the Hebrews are thus called from Heber from he is who they descend from. To consider only the name, this opinion would have some probability, for Heber lived prior to Abraham. If, however, it were true, all those of the tribe of Heber should have borne this same name to him, for seven generations separate Hebron from Abraham. (Gen. 11:16, 26) If, then, this name is prior to Abraham, or Abraham himself was called by that name, then the Hebrews derive their name from Heber. If, on the contrary, this name was not used until after Abraham, then it is not from Heber, but from Abraham that the Hebrews derive their name, since the children of Abraham are the first whom we see called of that name. Thus, in Genesis, Joseph and his brothers are referred to as the Hebrews. As it was known that Abraham had come from Syria in the land of Canaan (Gen. 17:4), that his house had grown there, that in reward of his law he had been filled with all sorts of goods, that he had been called king, prophet and father of many nations (Gen. 17:4), that with three hundred and eighteen men of his servants he had defeated five kings (Gen. 17:4), and that these events had not taken place in an ignored corner of the earth to remain forever unknown, the name of Hebrews was given to those who descended from that race. For all these reasons, Abraham was therefore worthy to become the leader of those who drew from him their origin. It was by a providential judgment of God that the chief and stump of the people of God was established in the land of Canaan, so that all who were born of him in their religion as well as in their way of life would be quite different then if he had not been himself before coming into the land of Canaan. God had renewed it entirely, and he himself had to found a new people in the religion of the true God. This is why the Apostle St. Paul is glorified to be born a Hebrew of Hebrew fathers (Phil. 3:5); it was for him a title of dignity, a recommendation, and a mark of nobility, to bear the name of him whom so many virtues had made pleasing to God, and who was the chief and the stock of his people. Reject this opinion if it is not conformable to reason, if it is despised if it appears unworthy, if it is entirely rejected if Abraham is not worthy of this prerogative, as guilty of flatteries towards him. What is this hostility against

Abraham, what is this rivalry which makes him dispute this glory by his enemies? And who are they, if not his own children? What have they then to do in Abraham to dispute this honor? And what have they so much to praise in Heber to judge him worthy of this prerogative? If we could examine his life, we might find that he worshiped idols, like Thare and Nachor, and the father of Nahor, who have not lived in a time far removed from him, and who, according to the testimony of Joshua, have served the foreign gods. (Josh. 24:2) Let those who support the contrary opinion tell us the reasons which militate here in favor of Heber, and what are the merits on which we keep silence; but these merits are void, for the Scriptures are common to us, and we see clearly what is due to each. If they think they can defend their opinion by the name alone, it is weak and improbable. The name of Heber could decide the question here if other testimonies supported this presumption, for others with the same name could claim this privilege without any right. The feeling in conformity with the truth is that which is supported not by name alone, but by solid reasons. Indeed, God having deigned to choose Abraham to vivify the human race in his person and to propose it to men as an example to God. follow to reach salvation, he had to repair in him what human frailty had made them lose. Now it has been proposed as a model in the resemblance of which the human race was to return to God, and which was to place men in possession of the true worship of God and of the language which had been given them in the first place. Adam was at first the image of God, and it was through him that the knowledge of God was to spread on earth; but after the ruin of mankind and the forgetting of the true God in which men had fallen, God made up his image in Abraham so that his faith in the true God would be fruitful again in abundance. It is not, then, contrary to reason, that the people who came forth from Abraham owed to him both his origin and his name. Would the name of Heaven be difficult for them, because it seems to have more analogy with the word Hebrew, and that the word Hebrews is said, and not Abraham! Let them observe that the Hebrew language, and not the Hebrews, are spoken of. If they wish to attack us on this point, they are beaten by their own weapons, and victory remains undecided between the two parties; it is reserved for him who will prove the truth of his assertions by good reasons, for although one is in a position on one point, one loses one's cause if one is in default on another. We say, therefore, that a letter has been suppressed for being pleasing to the ear, and that the Hebrews are said to be

Hebrew, because the pronunciation is softer. Thus we do not call the Jews who come from Judah ‘Judah’, but Jews. Everywhere, in fact, where reason requires it, one or more letters are suppressed or modified to make the pronunciation more agreeable. Thus, for the middle of the day, we say noon, and likewise in a multitude of similar cases. It is therefore proper, as we have shown, that the Hebrew people owe to Abraham his name as well as his language. It is therefore this tongue which was first given to Adam and to other men, and which to punish it the presumption which inspired the construction of the tower of Babel was confounded and divided into several languages, so that it ceased to exist, giving birth by the change of certain phrases to a multitude of other idioms, which nevertheless had the same expression. As to this primitive language, it was not entirely lost, but it was confused in the other languages. God then confounded the language of men to prevent them from understanding each other and to engage in more reckless excesses (Gen. 11:8). There were, then, as many tongues as there were divisions among men; each division established a different language in the country it inhabited. If we do not wish to admit that it is this language which, according to Scripture, was the only one spoken among men, it remains for us only that is, it was formed in detail of the other languages and reduced to a single idiom used by Abraham. As he was to be the father of a great number of nations, he spoke a language composed of many languages, and thus was the object of a general renewal. When those who are represented in the book of Genesis as having only one language, and the same manner of speaking from the East to scatter all over the face of the earth, preserve the use of the primitive language. (Gen. 10:31; 11:1) Indeed, this language given to the first man in paradise is spoken in no other country as any other language except by the Jews. And after the confusion of languages, we no longer find the trace of the language we call Hebrew. If, therefore, this language is not found in any country, or in any people, and Abraham was a native of Syria, whence came this language that he spoke, he or his descendants, if it were not the first, at least it was formed of several languages? Some languages, indeed, have similar expressions. But this hypothesis does not satisfy reason as that which holds that this language is the first, for reason shows the providential design of this fact. In this way, Abraham had to speak the language spoken by the first man so that Moses, in his history of the creation of the world and of man, used the same language that God used when he gave the first man the

name of Adam and the first woman the name of Eve. It was fitting that the account of Moses should be written in the language of those whose origin he tells us to teach as God had resumed his first designs and renewed the effects of his mercy in the person of Abraham.

## (Genesis 11)

### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 117. ON ABRAHAM.** — The faith of this patriarch was so perfect and so admirable that all the righteous by a wise judgment of God proclaim him the father of their faith, and that no one is worthy of God and of his affection if he bears the name of Abraham's sons. What makes his greatest glory in the eyes of God is that he did not hesitate to believe in things that seemed incredible, which deserves him among other rewards to see the Savior, in the hope of God, as our Lord Himself declared to the Jews: Abraham your father rejoiced in the hope of seeing my day; he saw it and rejoiced in it (Jn. 8:56). It was right that he who became a father by the merit of his faith should live the hope of his children in the distant past, a hope which God in his providential goodness should transmit as the Father, inheritance from a deeply religious father to his imitating sons of his obedience. Let us now see what was the object of this faith, that God might have judged it worthy of so great an honor, and of such a glorious reward. We praised Abraham's faith, but we have not yet told the object of his faith: God brought him out of his tent, and showing him the stars of heaven said to him: "Can you count these stars So shall your offspring be. Abraham believed God, and this was imputed to him as righteousness (Gen. 15:5; Rom. 4:3). He would have no great merit in believing in God, had he not believed an incredible and insane thing in the judgment of the world, because one could not naturally hope for what God promised him. Therefore, Abraham was the only one in the world having believed this promise, was separated from the world and justified. The incredulity of human wisdom serves to raise the greatness of this faith, and that heroic hope which believed against hope. The hopelessness of the worldly is the merit of the hope of the Christians. The defiance of the wicked here makes the reward of the faith of the good, for faith is stronger and more complete when its object is naturally

incredible. This almost desolate man believed that his wife, of a very advanced age, would give him a posterity so numerous that it could not be counted, because he considered the act itself promised to him less than he who promised it, and that he knew he could not lie. So his faith was imputed to him for righteousness. There would be stupidity in believing an absurd thing, the impossibility of which is known, if we had no guarantor for the authority of the person who proposes this thing to our belief. Abraham, therefore, demonstrates with admirable faith and great prudence, believing what is naturally incredible, and by confiding himself fully to him to whom one cannot refuse to believe without folly and without danger. What proves that our faith is reasonable is that it recognizes only God alone the power to do all that he promises. This is the strength and triumph of faith. Certain sages of the world, considering only the natural impossibility of these things, declare that it is a madness to believe them. They forget this maxim of the Apostle: and what appears in God as folly is wiser than men (1 Cor. 1:25). They would have the right to treat us as fools, if we knew here what nature evidently does not have in nature. Now, what is impossible to nature, we believe that God can do it if he promises it. What can be found unreasonable in this conduct? If the fact to the fulfillment of which we believe is indignant with God, it would be right to accuse our faith of stupidity, but if it is worthy of God, by the very fact that it is impossible for the creature, how can it not fill with praise the faith which gives as much to the Creator as it refuses to the feebleness of the creature! Abraham is therefore truly great and worthy of admiration for not having hesitated to believe in God's promise against the judgment of the world, because God can do what He promises. Although he was a native of Chaldea, he showed himself to be the teacher of the faith, and though he was competent in astrology, he preferred God's thoughts to the thoughts of man, considering that he was worthy to believe that God could do a thing whose fulfillment would escape the investigations of the human mind. He gave to his weakness the power of God, who, in order to bring forth the unique and incomparable grandeur of his majesty, had resolved to do things unbearable and impossible to the world. He thus wished to show that he was the master of creation, and that every creature must submit to his empire. The promise he made seemed impossible to all other men, but their unbelief is all the more the lively faith of Abraham. His faith is the chastisement of unbelievers, just as the iniquity of unbelievers makes his glory. He is at the same time the Father of

the faithful and the judge of the infidels. By his example, the good will receive as reward eternal life, Abraham is not troubled by this strange order, and he does not argue about whether he should obey God, who commands him to kill his son, while he defends homicide under the most severe penalties. The will of God inspires him with firmness, and he does not hesitate to believe in the providential wisdom of what God commands him. And yet it was this child who was the child of their old age and a divine promise, the reward of their faith, the testimony of their virtue, and on which rested all the hope of the posterity which God had given them promised. In order to accomplish this commandment more religiously, he did not inform the mother of the child, lest she should put obstacles to this sacrifice. He knew all the tenderness of the love of mothers for their children, and that is why he hides from him the sacrifice which is asked of him, because he does not want to put any delay in doing what God commands him, to teach us by his example that care and eagerness we must fulfill the commandments of God. For if Abraham, this faithful servant, has obeyed such a harsh and severe command, what obedience to much easier commandments ought not be? O faith full of devotion to God! O unwavering hope in the Lord, which is so dear and sweet, that it prevails over the tenderness of the fathers for their children according to these words of Scripture: "Glorify and see that the Lord is full of sweetness (Ps. 33:8)!" The holy patriarch was a prophet, and knew what the future had in store for him. He therefore did not hesitate to practice what our Lord recommends us in his Gospel, and to prefer the love of God to the affection he had for this beloved son, obeying the words of the Savior : "Whoever loves his father, or his mother, or his children more than me, is not worthy of me (Matt. 10:33)." It is thus that this patriarch, to be preferred of God above all others, did not hesitate to sacrifice his son to him.

#### **(Genesis 13:5-18)**

#### **1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 44. HOW CAN ONE PROVE BY THE TESTIMONY OF THE PROPHETS RECEIVED BY THE GENTILES UNDER THE NEW COVENANT THAT THE PROMISE THAT GOD MADE TO ABRAHAM WAS FULFILLED**

BY THE COMING OF CHRIST? — It is written in the prophet Isaiah: "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations. (Isaiah 56:7)." But the Jews may say, "The house of God, that is, the synagogue, is open to all men." We do not say the contrary, but on the condition that men will be circumcised before submitting to the law; for an article of this law commands them to be circumcised following the example of Abraham. There is, therefore, nothing new in this oracle of the Prophet, since from the beginning of Judaism no one has been forbidden from any nation whatever to embrace the practice of the law. The Prophet did not say anything again, let us say more, his words are superfluous, if the Gentiles have always been admitted to serve the God of Abraham, without ever having been defended. And the truth is that none of those who wished to submit to the law were rejected. Now, if it is so, it is very useless for the Prophet to remind us of a truth which has always been known and observed. But who would be meaningless enough to dare to say that such a great Prophet spoke unnecessarily and without reason? I do not know if one can hear this language with impunity without opposing it. Like the Jews to whom the prophets often reproached their crimes against God, and the confidence they placed in idols, refused to enter into the ways of penance and a sincere return to God, God, to confound them, declares that he will open his house to all nations to pray, and that instead of the Jews whom he rejects, he will admit other worshipers. If indeed the Gentiles have always been admitted to the practice of the law, as we have said above, how could the Prophet predicate this as a novelty, if not because he wanted to signify something other than this which was previously ordered? For he could not say of a thing that was done every day that it would be done in the future. It is therefore evident that these words are the condemnation of the Jews to whom the Prophet predicted that after their reprobation others will be called to receive the gift of the grace of God that had been promised to the Jews. Now the prophet Isaiah tells us what this promise is, when he says, "There will come a Redeemer who will deliver Zion and remove Jacob's impiety, and that is the covenant I will make with them (Is. 59:20)." This covenant is therefore the destruction of sins; it is the new covenant which God promised in these terms by the prophet Jeremiah: "Behold, the days come, Lord, and I will establish a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not according to the covenant I made with their fathers, in the days when I took them by the hand to draw them out of the land of Egypt, which they have made

vain, and I have punished them, says the Lord (Jer. 31:31)." He wants to speak of the evasiveness they made when they made a golden calf to worship him, and then they profane his covenant. So the tables on which the law was written were broken at the foot of the mountain, because the people deserved to receive more severe and painful commandments. But the Lord, full of compassion and mercy, promised by his prophets to change the law, and to replace it by an alliance entirely different from the first, that is to say, not only all that the former had of pain would be suppressed, but also all the precepts that were figurative, like the Sabbath and circumcision. They had groaned for a long time under this heavy burden, and God wished to deliver them from them wholly, that they might render him humble thanksgiving. But they preferred to persevere in the iniquity of their fathers, and did not wish to renounce the worship of idols; the Prophet therefore predicted that the Gentiles with the few Jews who had preserved the faith of the true God would enter into the new covenant to punish the perfidy of the Jews for a double punishment. For in this world they are burdened with the burden of precepts, and in the other life they will receive the just punishment for their crimes, because they have been unfaithful to God in the new as in the old covenant. God therefore declares that he gives this new covenant to replace the old one that was given to their fathers. He who serves God under this new covenant is no longer constrained to observe either the Sabbath, new moons, circumcision, or the distinction of food; it is enough to have the fear of God joined to the faith, because it is not by law but by faith that you are justified according to this testimony of the prophet Habakkuk: "The righteous will live by faith (Hab. 2:4)." Hence he no longer needs a great number of precepts to please God; some of them are sufficient from these other words of the prophet Isaiah: "When the number of the children of Israel is as many as the sands of the sea, the remnant only will be converted, for God in his righteousness will fulfill and abridge his word; yes, the Lord will give an abridged word on all the earth (Is. 10:22)." Thus God made known the abbreviated word of the law, that is to say, the new covenant which he had promised to the small number of those who, the midst of general unbelief had persevered in faith. He gives it the name of covenant, because, like the old covenant, it was confirmed by the testimony of blood; they both bear the same name, with the difference that the ancient covenant contained a great number of precepts, while according to the promise of God they are greatly reduced in the new. God had foretold to Abraham

that he would be the father of many nations. (Gen. 17:4-5) Therefore, his children were to be justified as the children, and to become children of Abraham, according to the promise of the Lord, without recourse to the observances which had been established only after the faith of one, Abraham, and by the faith which had justified Abraham. It is not, however, new and unprecedented that men have been justified without the observance of the Sabbath, circumcision, and other prescriptions of this kind. Enoch was a friend to God and merited to be transported (Gen. 5:44), nor was Noah the only righteous man that God found in the flood; Abraham himself did not owe circumcision to be justified. Abraham believed God, it is written, and his faith was credited to him as righteousness (Rom. 4:3). Circumcision was for him a sign of his faith in the promise that he would have a son in his old age. Abraham's merit does not come from conciseness, but from his faith. Consequently, faith alone is enough to justify men and make them children of Abraham by faith, not by circumcision of which they have no need; for the object of their faith is not the same which was imposed on the faith of Abraham. The Jews were subject to the precept of circumcision, because they were to bear the sign of Abraham's faith, not of their faith, as the distinctive sign of the children of Abraham according to the flesh; if they have faith themselves, they become his children by justification. What is the use of a man without strength to call himself the son of a powerful man? Is it not rather an obstacle for him, for it is a shame for the son of a man whose glory equals the merit of being the same without honor. Circumcision is so unmeritorious, that God threatens by the prophet Jeremiah to exert his vengeance on all who carry the sign of external circumcision but without being circumcised of heart (Jer. 4:4). But he is not angry with those who obey the circumcision of the heart without the circumcision of the flesh, because no one can please God without the circumcision of the heart. All who have received the circumcision of the flesh are the children of Abraham according to the flesh; those who practice the circumcision of the heart represent the children of Abraham according to faith, because they cut off from their hearts all the errors of the world and acknowledge God alone for their Father. What, then, is the circumcision of the flesh without faith to the Jew in order to attain the perfection of Abraham? Or in what way can the uncircumcision of the flesh hinder him, since no one can attain the justice of Abraham without being the imitator of his faith? It is therefore in vain that they glorify the circumcision of the flesh, since it has no merit in the eyes

of God. And if, as we have proved, it is better to have faith than to be circumcised, the Gentiles are better than the Jews, then they have faith, while the Jews have only circumcision. Which ones, do I say, will Abraham recognize for his children, those who are like him after the flesh or who are the imitators of his faith? But it was faith that bore witness to Abraham. Therefore he glories not in the flesh, but in faith, and he admits to the number of his children only those whom he sees to be the imitators of his glory. For how could he call his children those who have only remoteness for what made him pleasing to God and deserved the justification? He will rather see in them his enemies than his children; and indeed they seem to be declaring themselves to him by despising the faith which was the cause of his glory. There is nothing surprising in the incredulity of the Jews who refuse to receive the New Testament, since they have not been more faithful under the old covenant. Their revolts against God were continual, they never ceased to outrage him; therefore he imposed upon them severe precepts to keep under the yoke those haughty and inflexible requirements. They would never acknowledge that God was the source of all good; and yet how many favors they had received from Him, than from brilliant prodigies carried out in their favor! This is what he reminds them of through the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel: "I have lifted up my hand against them in solitude, to scatter them among the nations, and to spread them on the earth, because they did not observe my commandments, and rejected my precepts." And a little farther, "Therefore I have given them precepts that are not good, and ordinances where they will not find life (Ez. 20:33)." He teaches them why he has given them so many and difficult precepts; they had only shown ingratitude for such great benefits; he imposed upon them, under the inspiration of his justice, more severe commandments. He calls them precepts which are not good, though they are righteous, because far from justifying them, they turned to ruin, and that a punishment just that it is, is not good for him who suffer. In spite of their infidelities, God, in his goodness, promised to give a new covenant, where the law reduced to a few precepts would justify as Abraham those who believed in him, that without the observance of Sabbath, circumcision, and other precepts of this kind, and merely remaining faithful to the precepts of natural law, which defend homicide, adultery, and other similar crimes, they would be justified as had been Abraham. Since he was reviving Abraham's faith on earth, he wanted to put an end to all other prescriptions, and bring men back to the time of Abraham's faith. But

the Jews may say: Let us admit that the commandments given by Moses have ceased to oblige by this abridgment of the law; Is circumcision one of those precepts which ought to be repealed? It is through it that we bear the sign of our father, the character of the children of Abraham, which must never be repealed to be a perpetual testimony of our race. I answer that circumcision must have been observed in its time, that is to say, before God had given men the New Testament which he had promised. But as soon as the grace of God has discharged men from the burdens of the law, what is still need of circumcision? Now the new law, that is, the spiritual law, was given to put an end to carnal observances, and so that those who embraced it would bear the sign of this law. Thus, as in the Old Testament, the Jews bore the sign of Abraham to which the old covenant belonged, so the Christians under the new covenant must bear the sign of the Savior, the author of the New Testament. Indeed, just as the Hebrews derive their name from Abraham, Christians take their name from Christ. All those who still bear the name of Hebrews have not yet received the new covenant which God has promised; they render useless the blessings and mercy of God, who no longer wish that his people should bear the name of a man, but deign to give to men the very name of his Son. What then is this audacity in the Jews to say that it is their law, and not our own, that we practice, whereas David says loudly, "I will praise you among the nations" (Ps. 17:50; 55:10), and again: "Sit down at the same table with his people?" The Lord said to the prophet Jeremiah, "I knew you before I had formed you in the womb of your mother, and I sanctified you before that you did bring forth from his womb, and I made thee a prophet among the nations." (Jer. 1:5) Judaism has in its Scriptures distinct names, and is represented under the names of Jacob, or of Samaria, or of Jerusalem, or of Judea, or of Israel, but it is evident to the Gentiles that they are designated by other names than the Jews, and Jeremiah is more particularly our prophet, although God used all the prophets to announce that the Gentiles would share in his promise. These, he says in a more special way of Jeremiah because he is our prophet. It was he who was charged to predict that the new covenant would be more fruitful for the Gentiles than for the Jews, which we now see fulfilled. See, the new covenant has been preached by all the earth, and yet it is so rare, so difficult to find a Jew who has embraced the faith, that all the churches of the New Testament bear the name of the pagan nations as the prophet Hosea had predicted: "I will call my people who are not my people and my beloved

whom I had not loved (Hos. 2:24, Rom. 9:25)." God therefore rejects the Jews and calls the Gentiles by an effect of that mercy and grace by which he has deigned to call Abraham, for Abraham did not know the Lord before he was called. So he who deigned to call Abraham also deigned to call the Gentiles. Why, then, is this pretension to say: This is our law, when it is manifest that the gift of God belongs to all those who sincerely want it? Let them therefore cease this rash usurpation; the grace of God is the common heritage of all men. What boldness yet to deny that our Lord Jesus Christ was promised in the law, when they see Him gather in Him all the characters predicted by the law? All the nations that believe in him are justified, according to the promise made to Abraham (Gen. 22:18); he was born of a virgin in Bethlehem of the tribe of Judah, according to the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah, a race of David, as God had promised. (Jer. 31:31), He preached the new covenant which God had promised to establish with mankind, and after all the prophecies, miracles which he has effected, he has humbled himself, as predicted by all prophetic oracles; he suffered, he died, as it is written in the prophets. If they ask for the time when this promise is fulfilled, as it is fixed in the prophet Daniel (Dan. 9:24), they will find fulfillment of it at the time when Jesus Christ was born and suffered; for from the first year of Darius, king of the Persians, to the birth and passion of our Lord, and even to the ruin of Jerusalem, which took place under Vespasian, the Roman emperor, the seventy weeks that is to say, four hundred and ninety years, and this calculation is clearly established by the reigns of the different princes who succeeded one another. Tertullian himself makes this calculation in the book he wrote against the Jews (Ch. 8); but lest the exactness and precision of his calculation should draw him insults, we have passed over in silence. What difficulties can there be in this number, since the number of these years has been fulfilled? It is therefore an impudence without example, after the long space of time which has been added to the advent of the Savior, to say: He has not come. That in the time of the apostles, or when Our Lord still lived among men, malice could disguise itself to contradict the truth, and that, notwithstanding the evidence of the prophetic signs of Christ which shone in the Savior, the time of his coming to better hide his perfidy, at the right time. But now that many years have been added to the number predicted by the prophets, how impudent once again to deny the coming of Christ whose signs and times concur in demonstrating the coming? That a vase be full, but without overflowing, a spirit friendly to the

dispute may deny that it is full; but if it overflows, it puts an end to any discussion. Thus the Jews were able to say in the time of the Savior (although without good faith) that the calculations from Darius to Our Lord, which tended to prove that He was the promised Christ, were ill-established. For we may be mistaken in calculating the years, months, and days of the emperors, and we cannot have precise and incontestable dates here. But now that years and centuries are added to the precise number of years marked by the Prophet, what excuse remains for the Jews not to recognize Christ in him who has come, unless he accuses of falsehood (what God forbid!) the very author of the promise? For the time of promise is past, and the promise of the promise is denied; what else is there to say to the author of the promise, "You are a liar?" But not the one who has promised is the truth itself, we have as proof all the signs which the prophets have given of Christ and which we find united in the person of Christ. As for the Jews, who would be ashamed of escaping from their error, they do not think of the judgment which awaits them, for nothing is more guilty than to deny the truth of what one perfectly understands is not a lie.

#### (Genesis 14:18-24).

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 109. ON MELCHIZEDEK.** — Here is what we read of Melchizedek in the book of Genesis and also in the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews: Melchizedek, priest of the Most High God, appeared at the meeting with Abraham when he returned from the defeat of the kings, offered him bread and wine and blessed him, saying, "Blessed be Abraham of the Most High God who created heaven and earth and put your enemies into your hands (Gen. 13:18)." And to make us better understand the one who was represented by Melchizedek, the Apostle adds: "No doubt the one who receives the blessing is inferior to him who gives it (Heb. 7:3)"; words which the Apostle does not apply to the tradition of ecclesiastical ministry. Who, indeed, would dare to say that the rule instituted by the Lord to bless the faithful is superior to those which it blesses? It is therefore the mysterious presence of the Lord that is felt in these words of which he is the

object and which recall him to our memory. The sacred author has wished to show us here his personal dignity and his power. What then is the greatness of this man in comparison with whom Abraham has only the second rank, in spite of the superiority which his generosity and faith give him among the faithful? Let us understand here that this Melchizedek does not bless Abraham, like the priests, by pronouncing a solemn formula of blessing, but by a blessing peculiar to him, and which he received not by an oral tradition but by nature and substantially. The priests to whom we give the name of pontiffs have solemn formulas of blessing which have been transmitted to them, and which they recite on the men whom they bless, not always on those whom they desire, but upon those which they do not wish to bless, because the author of this rule knows in what soul he ought to shed his holy blessing. He, on the contrary, who possesses this blessing substantially in virtue of his nature, and whom Moses calls the priest of the Most High God, gives this blessing as he does. The words of blessing and his nature always agree with his will. He never errs in wanting to give it where it should not be, or refusing it when he should give it, the words of the blessing he utters always have their efficiency. Our priests, on the contrary, invoke the name of the Lord every day, and pronounce formulas of blessing, but very few of them receive the effect. The priests also bless those who are superior to them. Whatever saint we may be, we bow to receive the blessing, because it is not an invention of the priest, but a divine institution. The high priest Heli blessed Anna, and this blessing has not the merit of the grandmaster, but the faith of this pious woman, whose pure heart God knew. (1 Kgs. 1:17) If Melchizedek is declared superior to Abraham, it is not only because of priestly dignity, but by his nature, and the sacred writer wants to teach us that he is more than a man. It is impossible, indeed, to see only one man in one who is placed above such a great friend of God, of a man so full of faith that for love and fear of God he hesitated not to sacrifice his son, who was so dear to him. By what justice, by what works could he have acquired more merit than Abraham? What more could he do that Abraham did? In the first place, when he did not know God, and without yet seeing any decisive sign, God said to him, "Come out of your land and your kinsfolk and your father's house (Gen. 12:1)", And he immediately obeyed without delay, thus accomplishing the will, not only of God who spoke to him at that time, but of the Lord was to manifest himself to mankind. Does not the Savior say, "Whoever loves his house, his father, or his mother, or his brothers, or

his parents, more than me, is not worthy of me (Matt. 10:37)?" What then is the virtue and perfection of Abraham who fulfills the commandments of the Savior before they are proclaimed to the world? The Apostle recommends above all the practice of hospitality, Abraham so faithfully exercised it that it is his example which seems to have determined St. Paul to make this recommendation. He then thought that his posterity would multiply like the stars of heaven, which seems a madness to the eyes of the sages of the century (Heb. 13:2; Gen. 18:3), who are thus condemned by his example even before God had threatened to lose their wisdom, for it is afterwards that he says by his prophets: "I will lose the wisdom of the wise (Isa. 29:14)." Abraham still obeys the command of God, who commands him to circumcise himself, which he could not do without pain, and he submits to it to give his descendants the example of patience (Gen. 17:24). God promises him that he will have a son of Sarah his wife despite his advanced age, and he does not doubt for a moment. He thus taught to future centuries that faith in the authority of God must be so complete, that it does not allow the slightest doubt about the commandments or the promises he can make even though they appear contrary to reason. We must consider here the person rather than the words, for it is the person who confirms and makes possible what the words appear to be weak. It is God who promises, and we must believe that he can do what seems impossible to men. In what way would man be reprehensible by attributing to God a power which he does not recognize in himself? Thus Abraham on the command of God does not hesitate for a single moment to put to death the son that God has given him (Gen. 22:3), he is not surprised at the will of God who demands death of a child whom he had given him as a testimony of his goodness and power; he is too convinced that it is not for man to discuss the will of God, and that his orders and his actions are inspired by a sovereign reason. Now, in order to execute this order with the most eagerness, he leaves his wife unaware; he knew the weakness of mothers for their sons, and that the tears of tenderness might have hindered the act of religion which he could have accomplished; he teaches his son only at the hour of sacrifice, that his obedience may be full and entire at the command of God, in the execution of which he does not see a parricide, but a holocaust demanded by the just judge. What more heroic actions could have made Melchizedek to surpass Abraham, whose obedience we have seen. was never surprised at fault? Moses, who conversed with God face to face, was sent to his people and his brothers and

refused to go. The Prophet Jonah disobeys the order given him to go and preach to the Ninevites, and to another country where he was not from (Jon. 1:11). Job, this admirable man in all things, was, however, shaken by the death of his children; he tore his clothes, and cut his hair (Job 1:20), but we do not read that Abraham was grieved at the death of a son that was so dear to him, and we do not see that this son whom God commanded him to sacrifice trembled before this order that was given. We conclude from this that Melchizedek was more than a man, for he could not prevail over Abraham unless he was of a superior nature. Impassive nature possesses bliss by virtue of its substance, human nature obtains it by its actions. It does not have the perfection of divinity, it is therefore by exercise and by struggle that it becomes better from day to day, when its victories are more numerous than its defeats. If it were always impeccable in its actions, which is impossible, it would be better than God (far from us this thought), because if a nature that can commit like avoiding sin was always victorious from sin, it should be put above nature, which does not sin because it is impassive. There would not seem to be great merit in not sinning, because it cannot be; heroism would seem to have the faculty of ease and of not sinning. There is, therefore, this difference between the nature of God and the nature of man, that the nature of God is always happy in the security of his invincible eternity, while the nature of man only reaches happiness by work. Now it is necessary that the impassive beatitude should be diluted with that which is the fruit of the tribulations which thus bring joy. Impassive bliss has in it an inexhaustible source of happiness; for nature, on the contrary, it is only after great trials that it rejoices at having escaped death. Sadness is for it the means of animating happiness, and it's passability is irreconcilable with uninterrupted happiness. He, on the contrary, who is impassive by nature, is always happy, because he does not know sadness, and cannot even suspect that he can attain it. As to the human nature, although it succeeds in felicity through labor, it will not be exempt from trials, and scars will not fail. And how, in the midst of so many battles in which nature is sometimes defeated, could it not receive wounds? Impassive nature, on the contrary, remains inaccessible to any attack, any wound, to any defeat. Scripture, therefore, would not say of Abraham that he is inferior to Melchizedek, if Melchizedek was not of a superior nature to that of Abraham? What we have just said may seem more ingenious than dense. But if we examine the divine Scriptures, we will be able to raise still more and more of the more

excellent titles of glory. "This Melchizedek," says St. Paul, "king of Salem, a priest of the Most High God, who, when Abraham returned from the defeat of kings, appeared to meet him and blessed him, and who first signified the king of justice, was king of Salem, that is to say, king of peace; without father, mother, genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, is thus the image of the Son of God, and remains a priest forever." And to bring out these prerogatives in his place, he adds: "Consider therefore how great was he to whom Abraham gave the tithe of his richest spoils (Gen. 14:18; Heb. 7:1)." To show the full extent of the merit and power of Melchizedek, he praises Abraham by saying that he is the chief and prince of the patriarchs, that is, he is superior to all the others, but inferior to Melchizedek, is it not evident that Melchizedek is not a man, but that he is of a superior nature? But what do these two titles mean, king of peace and king of righteousness? Look closer and see: the sun seen from far away seems like a flaming beam, and at a distance you take money from a man and be called king of peace, and justice, peace is preached to men, as well as justice, but he is called king of peace and justice, to make you understand that it is from him that justice and peace derive their origin, for it is impossible to put above it what is subject to its direction, it is to the institute of justice and peace that men do what is pleasing to God. Now these two virtues, which are the mistresses of man, have Melchizedek as king. What then is the superiority of Melchizedek over man, since the virtues which govern mankind are subject to him, is it not being the king of kings? When St. Paul tells us that he is a king of justice and peace, he wants to teach us that he is the principle of both, and that just as our Lord Jesus Christ is the king, the author of life, Melchizedek is the author of justice and peace, because those who receive life through Jesus Christ are ruled by righteousness and peace. For in the hearts of the servants of God he sends righteousness and peace to serve as an ornament to the doctrine of the Lord. We read in Psalm: "Let righteousness and peace be embraced, and let the truth rise from the earth (Ps. 85:11)." And to be well aware of what justice he meant to speak, the Psalmist adds: "Righteousness has looked from heaven." Scripture predicts what was to happen in the days of the Savior, when the righteousness of God was given to the world through Jesus Christ, in the knowledge of the mystery of one God whom he had promised previously by the prophets. It was true, indeed, that the creature knew the truth of its Creator, and this righteousness having been manifested to the earth, put an end to the divisions

which the injustice of ignorance of God had engendered, and reign peace and harmony among the most divided minds, establishing them in the unity of the same faith. It was thus that one saw kissing justice, the peace and the truth exited from the same source. It was from the earth that the righteousness which was to teach men was raised, for the incarnation of Jesus Christ taught them the truth which they ought to know concerning the nature of God. Such is the righteousness of God. Peace also comes from him, to the apostle's testimony: "May the God of peace crush Satan under your feet." I do not see how these two things can be distinguished here, since the God of peace is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ himself, for he says: "I give you my peace (Jn. 14:27)." Why do you say that Melchizedek is the king of justice and peace? I do not understand how that distinction can be made. I therefore think that there is no difference here between the king of peace and the God of peace. As no one on earth should be called God, be reserved exclusively to the principle of all things, God establishes kings who would be like his image, and who, with the exception of the name of God, would have all his power; but as they are of earthly origin, they are the kings of men, but not the kings of peace and justice: for they themselves have believed above them righteousness that they are not permitted to despise. Justice for them is God himself, justice is God's own good, and he who transgresses it becomes guilty to the judgment of God. But for Melchizedek, Scripture does not represent him as an ordinary king among men, because he has under his authority justice which is above all kings. No one, in fact, can have justice under his rule unless he is impeccable by nature. Now it is under its rule, because it is he who has established it as a law destined to be a part of the world, to direct those who are subject to sin. The king of justice is therefore the one who rules the laws of which he is the author and who teach men what to believe and practice to arrive at happiness. We have already stretched ourselves long over the person of Melchizedek, and yet we say nothing worthy of him, unless we return to the Scriptures, which has long pressed us, and which shouts to us to draw us from the deep sleep which overwhelms us and call us to the intelligence not of the night, but of the day. Scripture tells us that Melchizedek is without father, mother, genealogy, and to prevent any interpretation would be less worthy of this personage, it adds that he has neither beginning of days nor end of life, Melchizedek, who was not subjected to birth or death, can testify so clearly to all

the subtleties of human reasoning, and what a mind so clever and skillful that he would dare to resist and to pretend to impose its interpretation on the sacred text, instead of accepting the meaning which it naturally presents violence is inflicted on the divine Scriptures, and they meet here as enemies the very people who seem to submit to it. There are some who maintain that we ought not to believe in the person of Melchizedek what the Scripture brings us, and who wish to turn the Scriptures to their thoughts. The authority of the Scriptures to use ploys against them, by declaring war to them under the appearance of peace, and by hiding hostile intentions under the guise of friendship. They pretend, therefore, that it is not to show the greatness of Melchizedek, but rather to show the obscurity of his condition that the Scripture tells us that he was fatherless and without a mother. It wished to show us that Melchizedek was of an unknown race, and was not of the tribe from which Abraham came, since there was no trace of his family in the law. That is why it says again, "and without genealogy," to make us understand that there is no mention of his origin in the law, that he is not born of any parents, and that it is to him that he owes the great qualities that distinguish him. Now Scripture has so great authority here that it exposes in a perfect order all the elements necessary for the cause. At first it said that Melchizedek was "without father, without mother." Let us see what was the mother of Nachor, the grandmother of Abraham, and the mother of Thare; nor do we see what Abraham's mother was, not to mention the others. Shall we say that they did not have mothers? If the Scripture had said only "without a father," there would be a specious reason, for it has us preserved the names of the fathers of all of whom it speaks. Scripture adds: "And without genealogy." If it expresses itself in this way to show that his birth is not mentioned in the law, it was enough to say: "Without a father," because no one knows his father. But it puts us still more clearly on the path of truth by adding: "Having neither beginning of days nor end of life." Tell me, whoever you may be, who wish to do violence to the text, how do you explain these words? What does it mean to have neither the beginning of days nor the end of life? It is certainly sufficient to say that the genealogy of Melchizedek was not inscribed in the law, and that, by the same token, it must have been believed that he was of foreign origin. But one can say that he was taken away from this world like Enoch, and that is why he does not have end of life. Who then does not see a beginning of days? Will you say: It is because there is no mention of the day of his birth. But is

the birth of others mentioned? and for you, however, the one whose day of birth is not mentioned, must be regarded as having no beginning of days? But then the same conclusion can be applied to others. Supposing now that he was taken from this world, he was not for that reason without life, for everything that lives in the expectation of death has a purpose. Stop these vain contestations, which seem to please you. It is better to be vanquished by truth than to triumph over truth by falsehood. It is a loss rather than a victory, for though the truth seems to have loss in the eyes of man, it remains victorious in the eyes of God because its reason is invincible. Our mind must therefore be conquered by the law, in order to receive the meaning which it offers it, and not impose upon it an interpretation at will, by violently substituting its authority for that of the law. Listen to what Zorobabel says: "Truth triumphs over everything (3 Esdras 3:12)." Now Melchizedek reveals to us the future mystery of the Incarnation and the Passion of the Savior, first restoring to Abraham, as to the father of the faithful, the Eucharist of the body and of the soul, blood of the Lord, to make the Father the truth that was to be fulfilled in the children. If we want him to have been a priest like Aaron, or the present priests, to be told, to be shown the place where he lived, the temple or the synagogue in which he gathered the people, and offered sacrifices to him, or the people who gathered round him. For if he exerts his priesthood on earth, no doubt there existed, and before Abraham, a people whose priest he was, and this people now worshiped the true God. How then did Abraham become the leader of the believers, and it was through him that God was known to his people? In the same way, if Melchizedek taught men on earth the fear of one God, why choose Abraham to give his name to the people of God, since the servants of the true God could be found among those who gathered around of Melchizedek? What more do we read in the hymn which is found in Deuteronomy? When the Most High divided the people, when he separated the children of Adam, he marked the limits of the people, according to the number of angels of God. And he chose the people of Jacob to be especially his (Deut. 32:8). If there were no other people of God in the world other than the children of Israel, why should there be found another people who followed the doctrine of Melchizedek against the contrary testimony of the prophet? Since he names all the peoples of the world, and gives only to the children of Abraham the name of the people of God, the logical consequence is that he denies that with the exception of the children of the God of Abraham, the others

had the knowledge of God, because God is known in the alleged. Melchizedek, priest of the Most High God, appeared as a symbol of the holy mysteries which the future was to reveal. The blessing was to be given later to the people of God by a minister of God to whom we give the name of priest. Melchizedek therefore appears as the precursor of the sacred person of the Son of God, and precedes him to do him honor, though inferior to him in dignity. Let us then leave what we have said of Melchizedek, Scripture says a thousand times more for the confusion of the opponents. Indeed, after these admirable testimonies to Melchizedek, Scripture confuses spiteful spirits by adding: "He is thus the image of God and he remains forever." Consider then who is the object of your unchallenged discussions and if he inspires no reserve, at least fear Jesus Christ, to whom it is like, according to the authority of Scripture. The Apostle comes insensibly and by order to the excellence of his nature, and if the prerogatives which precede have impressed upon the spirits, that is, that Melchizedek was king of justice and peace, has appeared in a visible body without having either father or mother, that is to say without being born, having neither beginning nor end, the last trait adds to all that he has just said a new degree of credibility. Who would dare to say, unless renouncing reason, that these glorious prerogatives are not suited to him whom the Scriptures declares like the Son of God, and who remains a priest forever? But he cannot be like the Son of God unless he has the same nature. And what is so incredible that Melchizedek appeared in a humorous form, as soon as we understand that he was the third person of the Trinity? For if the Christ who is the second person has frequently appeared in the form of a man, what doubt can we raise on what we have said? Do not we read in a psalm: "You are a priest for eternity according to the order of Melchizedek (Ps. 109:4)?" These words of the confession of all relate to the person of Jesus Christ, because Christ is a priest for eternity according to the order of Melchizedek. But Christ is the sovereign priest, and Melchizedek occupies the second rank. Now, if Melchizedek is only a man, would it be proper that Jesus Christ should be a priest for eternity according to his order? We see them both alike, both clothed in one ministry, because they have one and the same nature. But since the authority of one God must be preserved in every way, the third person appears here subordinate to the name of the Father. As for Christ, he holds the place of the Father, he is like his minister, and that is why he is given the name (the priest). Similarly, the Holy Spirit, as minister, is also

called the priest of the Most High God, but not the sovereign priest, as our brethren presume in the oblation: for although Christ and the Holy Spirit are consubstantial, it is nevertheless necessary to preserve to each one the rank given him. The priests are given the name of envoys because they are the representatives of the one who sends them, and they are like his image, and this is the reason why Christ and the Spirit which is the natural image of the Father, are called his priests: God manifests Himself in their person, as our Lord has said: "He that sees me sees my Father (Jn. 14:9)." Now, if the Lord has revealed Himself in the divine actions which He has effected, and if these actions are the works of the Holy Spirit as he declares: "It is in the Spirit of God that I cast out demons", God manifested Himself in the Holy Spirit.

### **(Genesis 15:16)**

#### **1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 10.** GOD HAVING FORETOLD TO ABRAHAM THAT THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL WOULD BE FREED FROM THE DOMINION OF THE EGYPTIANS. THE FOURTH GENERATION, WHY DOES THE LAW SAY, "THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL SHALL COME FORTH OUT OF THE LAND OF EGYPT INTO THE FIFTH GENERATION?" — To consider only the words, they seem to contain a contradiction, but this contradiction disappears if we attach ourselves to the very meaning they present. The law speaks in intelligible language to the attentive and serious minds, and the truth which is hidden to the careless minds reveals itself to souls full of religious solicitude. God indeed said, "In the fourth generation (Gen. 15:16)," and Moses wrote, "In the fifth generation (Exod. 13:18)," it is Moses who relates these two versions, and one cannot admit the intention of wishing to deceive a man by whom the divine power has performed such great prodigies. We must, therefore, examine the signification of these words, for Holy Scripture never speaks uselessly and without reason. God and Moses each took a different starting point here. God counts the four generations who were born in Egypt; Moses adds to these four generations the one from which they came out when the Israelites entered Egypt. "The children of Israel," he said, "came out of Egypt to the fifth generation." He embraced all the generation that came into Egypt

and the four that were born in Egypt. From Abraham, the exit of the children of Israel from Egypt is eight generations. For after the promise made to Abraham, they dwelt in the land of Canaan two hundred and fifteen years, and two hundred and fifteen years in Egypt. It is these years together that the Apostle understands when he says in his Epistle to the Galatians: "The law was given after four hundred and thirty years. Four generations were born in the land of Canaan, the first in Jacob, the second in Jacob, the third in Levi, the fourth in Gerson, Caath, and Merari. And Aram brought up Eleazar, and his brethren, which formed the third generation: and Eleazar begotten Phinehas, and it came to pass, that he was the firstborn of Egypt was the fourth generation, and these were the four generations that were born in Egypt: therefore the Lord said unto Abraham, *Your seed shall dwell in a foreign land, and shall be reduced to bondage: but I will deliver them, and they shall come forth out of this land of exile after the fourth generation* (Gen. 15:13) Is it not evident that God only wanted to speak exclusively of what was accomplished in Egypt? Moses, on the contrary, wanted to add this generation which came to Egypt with Jacob his father, and from which came forth the four following. Hence these words: *The children of Israel came forth out of the land of Egypt into the fifth generation.*

### (Genesis 17:10)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 12. WHY DID ABRAHAM RECEIVE CIRCUMCISION AS A SIGN OF HIS FAITH?** — If you want to pay attention to it, you will see a perfect fit in what at first sight might seem to you devoid of reason. Abraham believing that he would have a son in which all nations would be blessed, and who would be the principle of all holiness, received the sign of this promise on the member by whom the generation of children begins, it tends to a higher holiness. If we were tempted to see in it something different, let us remember that circumcision was a subject of joy for Abraham, and that his children were always glorious in this testimony. Indeed, Achior, one of the princes of the idolatrous nations, witnesses of the great wonders of the God of Abraham, who by the hand of a simple woman had cut off the head of that general of the olives Assyrian militia, whose whole

land dreaded power, wished to receive circumcision himself as a mark of honor and dignity (Judith 13:27; 14:16). Is not a Christian proud to have lost an eye or a member for the name of Jesus Christ? does he not discover this part mutilated in the eyes of men as a title of glory? And in this way, a momentary loss for faith is a real gain. The circumcision which Abraham received as a sign of his faith, was therefore for him not a mutilation of the soul, but a mark of honor. Now this ceremony signified in the spiritual sense that the clouds of the flesh were to be cut off from the hearts of men by the faith of Jesus Christ, because the error of the senses, covering the hearts of men as a cloud, an obstacle to the Creator's knowledge. Now, Abraham, to whom God promised that the Christ who was to dispel this cloud would be born one day of his race was circumcised, because he believed that a son would be born to him that would destroy this error. Judge now whether it was not proper that he should receive on this part of the body the sign of his faith.

#### (Genesis 17:10-11)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 10. WHY DID GOD IMPOSE ON THE JEWISH PEOPLE CIRCUMCISION AND OTHER PRECEPTS THAT DID NOT EXIST BEFORE AND HAVE LOST ALL AUTHORITY NOW? —** Circumcision is the sign of Abraham's faith, and it was established to be the distinctive sign of the children of this patriarch who received this sign after having believed in the promise of God. The precepts that relate to the sanctification of the Sabbath have been given as a testimony of the past and a figure of the future. This Sabbath, which is like the coronation of each week accomplished, is the figure of the Sabbath which must one day bring us into eternal rest. (Exod. 20) The law concerning food was not given at the beginning, but when under the inspiration of unbelief the Jews refused to believe the words and promises of God; it was then that they received imperfect precepts as the prophet says (Ez. 20:25), and which were intended to lower their haughty heads and to bring them back to better feelings. It was not right, indeed, that all creatures were subordinate to proud and obstinate men. But when the

mercy of God was poured out on men, she gave them freedom in the choice of food. And so the apostle St. Peter said, "Why did you lay on the heads of your brethren a yoke that neither our fathers nor us could bear?" (Acts 15:10)

**(Genesis 17:11-12)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 29. WHY DID GOD COMMAND THE CIRCUMCISION OF THE CHILDREN ON THE EIGHTH DAY?** — God commanded to circumcise every male child on the eighth day after his birth, because after the number of seven days had passed, the eighth day became like the first after the Sabbath, and was no longer the eighth, but the first. As the salvation which Christ was to bring to the world was to take place on the first day called the day of the Lord, because the Lord resurrected that day after the Sabbath; the figurative sign of salvation was given in circumcision to make known the future regeneration even under the law of circumcision. It was by faith that men were to be saved, and this faith received its confirmation on the first day of the resurrection of the Savior; the figurative sign of salvation was thus established on the first day in the law of circumcision, which was also to be the sign of the faith of Abraham. Harmony is therefore complete here; the sign of the past faith which was given on the first day, was the figure of the future faith which was firmly established on the first day.

**(Genesis 19:25)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 13. IF GOD'S JUDGMENTS ARE RIGHT, WHY WERE THE CHILDREN CONSPIRED WITH THEIR PARENTS IN THE FIRE OF SODOM?** — In order to bring out the greatness of the crime of the inhabitants of Sodom, God wanted the punishment to be extended until the death of their children, in order to destroy even the last remains of this guilty race. But did not God act in their interest lest, by prolonging their lives, they should follow the

example of their fathers? because they are exempt from the punishments of hell, because they have been victims of a crime they did not commit. The parents are responsible for the double responsibility of their punishment and that of their children, because to erase the traces of their crimes, it was necessary to destroy all their posterity. Just as children rejoice in the virtues of their parents, because they are for them a title of glory, so they have no right to complain about the death that strikes them to punish the crimes of those who have given the day. They are associated with benefits, they must be punished. In Egypt, children were also punished for the faults of their parents, but to bring back these regulators to more just feelings. The other wonders could not have led them to believe in the God represented by Moses and to adore him; this scourge had for the last time, by striking them with terror, to make them confess and expiate their hardening, and to spare them a more rigorous chastisement. The crime of parents is the cause of the death of children. However the children have paid this debt, they will one day be the accusers of their parents, because the very blood of their children has not been able to triumph over their treachery. It is therefore not for the future life, but for the present life that the children have suffered the punishment due to the crimes of their fathers. And it is not for them a slight favor to escape guilt without, however, being in glory. We see men asking earnestly at the end of their lives to profess the true faith, in order to obtain, if not the crown, at least their pardon; How, then, can those who by their conduct in their regard have neither to implore the forgiveness of their faults, nor to obtain an extraordinary reward, because they have not deserved it by their labors? Compare a moment of suffering with a torment that lasts for centuries. Consider, moreover, that a great number give themselves much trouble, and for lack of perseverance, not only lose the fruit of their labors, but are guilty of punishment. Add to this that it is difficult for those born of vicious parents, who have been brought up or who have lived in the society of the wicked, to bend their souls under the yoke of divine law. See here again if God did not act wisely towards these children.

**(Genesis 22:16).**

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT

**QUESTION 3.** THE ANCIENT LAW SHOWS US GOD MAKING OATHS (GEN. 22:16, EXOD. 33:1), FOR HE SAYS, "I HAVE SWORN BY MYSELF," SAYS THE LORD. THE SAVIOR, ON THE CONTRARY, FORBIDS TO MAKE OATHS, HAS HE NOT DESTROYED THE OLD LAW BY DESTROYING IT? — Before the knowledge of God was poured out on the earth, men could not make men believe anything new and unheard of until then by confirming the promise by an oath made in the name of him whose acquaintance they did not yet know sufficient. But when this knowledge had spread, it was forbidden to swear in the name of him in whom it was not permitted to suspect even the lie. That is why the Savior no longer wanted his servants to swear an oath, he only commanded them to behave always in such a way as to add faith to their words. The oath is demanded only by the disloyalty or faithlessness of a deceitful heart, as men are accustomed to deceive, one imagines that the fear of God will inspire them with more respect for the truth, or that it will be enough for the one who will be deceived and who, by the same, acquires the right to complain.

**(Genesis 27:27)**

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 11.** IF THE WILL OF THE RIGHTEOUS MAN IS GOOD, WHY DID NOT ISAAC BLESS ESAU AS HE WISHED, BUT JACOB WHOM HE WOULD NOT BLESS? — The will of the just man is good, considered in his conscience; but as to foresight, it remains alien to unfortunate events. For God alone can judge things to come. That is why the righteous one, to consider only the outside, believed that his eldest son deserved to be blessed preferably. But God, who knows what is most secret, can see that the younger deserves this blessing, to show that this blessing was not a human favor but a grace from God; for it is not to the merit of man, but to the dignity of employment, that the blessing of God is attached. We see in the book of Numbers that God said to Moses and Aaron, who

were priests, "Call upon my name on the children of Israel, and I, the Lord, will bless them (Num. 6:27)." Thus grace is transmitted to men by the ministry of those whom God chooses for this purpose, without the will of the priest being an obstacle or an advantage; God only takes into account the character of the person who asks for the blessing. Let us understand the greatness of the priestly dignity. The Evangelist, speaking of Caiaphas, said that high priest, who carried the wickedness to the last restrictions by having the death of the Savior. "He did not say that of himself, but this prophecy, because he was high priest of this year (Jn. 11:51)." We see that the Spirit of graces is not attached to the person, whether worthy or not, but to the succession of the priestly order. Therefore, whatever may be the merit of a man, he has no power to bless unless he is chosen and ordained to fulfill this sacred function; but it is always from God that the blessing receives its efficacy.

### **(Genesis 32:30)**

#### **1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 71.** JACOB WAS CALLED THE MAN WHO SEES GOD (GEN. 32:30), AND MOSES SAW GOD FACE TO FACE. (EXOD. 33:11) THE LORD ALSO SAYS, "I SAW WITH MY OWN EYES THE GOD OF ARMIES." (ISAIAH 6:5) ON THE CONTRARY, THE EVANGELIST ST. JOHN SAYS: "NO MAN HAS EVER SEEN GOD. (1 JN. 4:12) SO HERE THERE IS A CONTRADICTION. — To speak according to the truth, no man has really seen God, neither the Father, nor the Son. If the Scripture tells us that men have seen Him, it is by intelligence, for it could only appear to them in figure. Just as without knowing the emperors, we see them in image and not in reality, so God was seen in the sense that men understood that God appeared to them in a rational and not substantial way, for God cannot be seen in his nature. To put the difficulty of this question into the light of day, let us try to explain the meaning of John's words. For he wanted here to reveal to us a hidden truth which is part of the doctrine of salvation: "No man," he says, "has ever seen God; the only Son who is in the bosom of the Father has manifested Himself." (Jn. 1:18) Let us examine the meaning of these words of the Evangelist; to show us that there is no truth that no man has ever seen God, he places this statement on the lips of the Son himself, who cannot be

deceived because he is in the bosom of the Father. Now, what is the bosom of the Father, except the feeling of love of the true Father for his Son by the unity of nature which is common to them? No one has ever seen God except the only begotten Son, which is what the Apostle of God revealed among other things to St. John the Baptist: "It is not that anyone has seen the Father, there is only one who is of God who has seen the Father." Now it is to condemn the Jews who would neither hear, nor believe that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, that the Evangelist proves to them that it is this same Christ who appeared as God to the patriarchs, and that the Father has never been seen except by the Son. Indeed, by denying that God the Father was ever seen, and declaring, however, that God appeared to the patriarchs, the Son of God wants to reveal himself and show that it is he who appeared as God to their fathers. This is why he says to the Jews in speaking of his Father: "You have never heard his voice nor seen his face." (Jn. 5:37) So there is no contradiction in saying that God all at once has been seen and is invisible.

#### (Genesis 49)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 6. WHAT IS THE BLESSING THAT JACOB GAVE TO HIS CHILDREN?** — Jacob predicted what was to happen to each tribe in the midst of the Jewish people, not only from current and present causes, but from non-existent causes, of which the seed itself did not yet appear. He predicted what each tribe should be; their manners, their faithfulness, their obedience, their disorders, their excesses, their contempt for the faith, and how those who had left the same father would be far from following the same path. Indeed, some have made progress in good, others in evil, others have remained what they were. There was therefore no need for them to glorify the privilege of their birth since Jacob predicted that some of them who had the same origin would be reprobate, that many would perish and be replaced by others who for their shame and condemnation would be grazed from the tree of which they were detached. The predictions of this holy patriarch thus embrace all the people composed of all the tribes, the small number of the good as well as the multitude of the wicked. Though he gave authority to Joseph for a time, it was Judah, however, which he placed at the head of all the tribes; no, not that all

who are of the tribe of Judah should be worthy of this preeminence, but because the Savior who is the true king was to come out of the tribe of Judah according to the flesh.

**(Genesis 50:24)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 25. WHY DID JOSEPH, AFTER PREDICTING THE FUTURE, BESEECH THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL TO CARRY HIS ASHES FROM EGYPT WHEN GOD DELIVERED THEM? —** It is an incontestable truth that Joseph did not make this recommendation to the children of Israel without cause. It cannot be supposed that the man whose gaze had plunged into the future spoke here without reason. He was full of a profound religion for the Creator God; he also knew what a veneration they had for the Egyptians, who remembered the wisdom of his administration during the famine which weighed upon Egypt. He therefore wished to take away this cause of error from him after his death, and to prevent them from rendering him worship, which belongs only to the Creator, for he knew all too well that the vain and light people are inclined to render divine honors to the dead rather than the living. He proves by this conduct that he did not share the vain superstitions of the Egyptians, since he orders to carry his ashes so that they do not become a subject to offend God. The Apostles imitated this example. Paul and Barnabas, perceiving that they wished to offer them a sacrifice, and knowing how much God abhorred such idolatry, tore their clothes, exclaiming, "What are you doing? we are men like you (Acts 14:14)." And they turned away the people from this sacrilegious design.

## EXODUS

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT
<p><b>(Exodus 3:2)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 42.</b> WHY WAS THE ANGEL WHO WAS SENT TO SPEAK TO MOSES APPEARED TO HIM ON THE MOUNTAIN IN THE MIDST OF FIRE AND A BUSH? — God is the Most High, so it was fitting that He should appear on an elevated place, that is to say, nearer to heaven. And as the fire always seeks the higher spheres and tends to ascend to heaven, the Lord has judged it convenient to manifest itself in the form of an element which, by its nature, always tends to rise in the air. He appeared in the middle of a bush to show that this bush was the figure of men's sins. Now, as it was to fight sin that he had come down to give the law, and the thorns are in Scripture the figure of sins, "I waited," said God by his prophet, "that produced grapes, and produced only thorns," (Isa. 5:2), and that the law did not immediately punish sin, but make it known; the fire did not consume the bush, that is to say, the law that was given did not render the fishermen guilty and worthy of punishment for the past. Sins are not essentially about human nature, they are only accidental; in the same way</p>	<p><b>(Exodus 3:2)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 7. OT</b> WHY DID THE ANGEL WHO WAS SENT TO SPEAK TO MOSES APPEAR TO HIM IN THE MIDST OF A BUSH OF FIRE? — One of the properties of the angelic nature is to be simple and to always tend to rise to higher things rather than to lower oneself to the earth. This is why the Lord wanted to appear in form and in the midst of fire, whose nature always tends to rise in the heights where Jesus Christ is. He appeared in the middle of a bush, because the bush is armed with thorns that wound and is easy to ignite, and yet it was not consumed by fire. Fire is the emblem of the law, which is like a fire for sinners. The bush is the figure of sins, and the Savior represents it as being compared to other trees as the emblem of the evil tree. Sins are nothing more than acts of malice. So when fire appeared as the symbol of the law, he did not consume the bush, just as the law given because of past sins did not punish them; he has suspended the effects of his justice, and exercised it only against those who despise his authority. So the Lord appeared in the midst of the fire and</p>

<p>the bushes, that is to say, the woods which bear thorns, have no thorns at their roots. It was therefore consistent with the reason that God appeared in this form to Moses.</p>	<p>bush, because fire in the bush is the figure of the law.</p>
---	---

### (Exodus 4:24)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

##### **QUESTION 16. WHY DID THE ANGEL WHO WANTED TO KILL MOSES, IN THE ROUTE, BE APPEASED BY THE CIRCUMCISION OF HIS CHILD?**

— At the sight of the angel who threatened him, Moses repaired an omission which had been at home without purpose. The anger of the angel stopped before the completion of this ceremony, deferred by negligence. Now, this anger of the angel that threatens Moses to take his life, comes from the fact that the fault of a man raised in dignity has a particular character of gravity. This gravity is always in direct proportion to the elevated position one occupies. The fault committed by a man whom God had chosen to be the sovereign chief of his people was therefore very great. Moses was going to stand before the children of Israel as the messenger of the God of Abraham, and he did not bear the sign of the righteousness of Abraham, whom he knew to be a title of glory to the Jews, and he exposed to pass for a seducer or not to be received as the envoy of God who had chosen Abraham. He had not circumcised his children during his stay in the land of Midian; He was not to take them with him to Egypt, from where he was going to draw his brothers, or to circumcise them first for the reasons we have given. Zipporah, wife of Moses, as the Scripture recounts summarily, knowing for what reason the angel was angry with her husband, took a sharp stone and circumcised his son, and the angel departed. She soothes by this action the anger which the negligence of Moses had excited against him. Scripture often speaks in a very concise form of things which the very subject it treats must imply; for example, in these reproaches that the Savior addresses to the Jews: Why did you even violate the command of God to

remain faithful to your tradition? for God has made this command: Honor your father and your mother; and this other: Whoever has insulted his father or mother with words will be punished with death. But you say, Whosoever shall say unto his father or to his mother, Every gift that I offer of my good shall be your reward, and after that he shall not honor his father and his mother." (Matt. 15:3-6, Exod. 20:12) Here, of course, the Savior abridged his speech, and implied that the Jewish priests, by engaging in greed, despised the law of God. By a show which impiety alone could inspire, they gave to the children who curse their father and mother the advice of offering to God what they would like, and thus to be freed from the sentence pronounced against the children who insult their children's parents. But the children in this council had nothing but contempt for their parents against the express command of God. So Moses saw the angel angry with him, understood the reason, and told his wife what was to be done to calm the anger of the angel who wanted to take his life. This is what is implied in the story, as well as what we have pointed out in the reproaches addressed to the Jewish priests.

#### (Exodus 7:10)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 8. DID NOT MOSES DO ANOTHER MIRACLE BEFORE PHARAOH THAN THAT OF THE ROD TURNED INTO A SERPENT? —** Whoever would be tempted to reproach Moses, tells us what other prodigy he should have done. He changed his rod into a serpent to impress terror, but without doing any harm, because the natural numbness of the snake makes his fury slower. If Moses had made a lion, bear, or other animal appear, how could those who were present have escaped? God did not want this serpent to cause the death of anyone; his intention was only to inspire a salutary fear and to manifest his power. It was by the snake that the sin of our first parents had begun, it was also the sight of a snake that was to recall the remembrance of the knowledge of God, and the necessity to change one's life so that sin was destroyed by the same means that had helped to make him commit. So again, it is through a woman that sin originated, it was by a woman that it was erased, by Mary, mother of Our Lord Jesus Christ who destroyed the kingdom of sin: Eve was still a virgin when she succumbed to sin,

just as Mary was also a virgin when she was chosen to be the Savior's mother. Thus all that had perished was restored to its former state; it is by taking from the fruit of the tree that the kingdom of heaven was lost, it is by a tree that we recover our rights to this kingdom. "The Lord," said the Psalmist, "reigned by the wood." (Ps. 95) It was by the same design that the world had to be repaired at the same time that it was created, that is to say, at the beginning of the first month which is the epoch of the Passover. There is therefore no other bad nature than the transgression of the law since sin is erased by the same means used to commit it.

### **(Exodus 12:11)**

**QUESTION 116. THE REASON FOR THE PASSOVER.** — The word Passover, my dear brothers, comes from the word passion, as we learn from the figure of this mystery which was celebrated in Egypt by Moses, the faithful servant of God, to the testimony of Scripture: "Here is the Passover of the Lord's sacrifice." (Exod. 12:11) But why was this mystery celebrated by the blood, why was life repaired by death, so that when it was believed to make a greater number of victims, did it suffer to restrain its power by the blood of the Savior, and to receive the blow which undermined its empire from that very death in which it believed it had displayed all its power? By a marvelous disposition of Divine Providence, death finds death in its work. As it always wishes evil, God seemed to yield to it for a time, so that, being destroyed in its unjust endeavor, it could not complain of being deprived of its empire over men. God can do everything, it is true, but he does nothing that is contrary to reason. He himself follows the rules of justice that he requires of men, without ever abusing his power. God has therefore shown admirable providence towards the human race; the rights and decrees of divine justice have been safeguarded and fulfilled, and man has been delivered from the death which held him in his chains for good reason. But as he had been deceived by the envy of the devil, it seemed just to God to come to his aid. He was condemned by God's judgment, but Satan was the cause. In the same way that it seemed right to God to deliver man, it would have been unjust to effect this deliverance by an act of his power, without the harmony of justice. The man having been defeated by the persuasions of Satan, the demon stood up like an accuser, to

oppose the mercy. God, therefore, ensures that he who glorifies himself in the sin of man, should be convinced in the light of sin, that the conscience of his crime may render him any contradiction impossible. The Son of God became man, and preaching righteousness to men, inciting against him the hatred of the devil, because he turned them away from vices of which the demon is the father, and this hatred went so far as to put him to death he who did not know sin. It was then that the devil himself was convicted of sin, and of a sin much greater than that of the man he accused. By virtue of a decree of God, he claimed that the man belonged to him because of his sin, because the one who sins ranks with the party of the devil, but he was convinced of a much greater crime, when he dared put to death the one who had not sinned to extend his empire over him. It was, therefore, death which struck a mortal blow to death itself; the outpouring of blood saved the blood; that is to say, as I have recalled, that the author of death who is the devil, having been convicted of a crime in the death of the Savior, lost all rights over his blood and blood to us all; for just as by the sin of the one Adam alone did he hold all men under the bondage of death, he saw himself carried off all men by the innocence of one. The blood of the Savior poured out unjustly had the reward of victoriously saving the blood to which it owed its origin, and of restoring it to its former state by elevating it to a greater perfection. Conquered death dares not contradict its conqueror. Blessed, then, is the mystery of the Passover, which redeems us by blood, triumphing over death by death, just as it is customary to triumph by the poison of the very action of poison.

### (Exodus 20)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 7. WHAT ARE THE TEN WORDS THAT WERE WRITTEN ON THE TWO TABLES, OR WHAT WORDS WERE ENGRAVED ON EACH TABLE, AND WHAT WAS THEIR NUMBER? —** These ten words are the ten commandments. This is how the Savior calls the feeling that he asks the Jews, among other things: "I have a word to ask you too; answer me: Where did John's baptism come from? From heaven or men? (Matt. 21:24) He gives this feeling the name of speech. It is for a similar reason that Scripture tells us that ten words were

written on the two tables, and these ten words are ten different thoughts. Here is the first word: "You shall have no other gods but me." (Exod. 3) Then comes the second: "You will not make any image of what is above in heaven, nor of what is down on the earth, or in the waters under the earth. " God adds in the third place: "You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain, for God will not regard as innocent one who has taken in vain the name of the Lord his God," that is, you do not take the name of your God to support a lie and perjury that imposes that name. The fourth commandment reads, "You shall keep the Sabbath of the Lord your God, and you shall not do any servile work in this day." These first four words relate directly to God and are the subject of the first table. Others: The first word of the table: "Honor your father and your mother," the second: "You shall not kill;" the third: "You shall not be adulterous"; in the fourth, "You will not stumble"; The fifth: "You shall not bear false witness; The sixth: "You will not covet anything that belongs to your neighbor." The Apostle St. Paul tells us that these were the commandments of the second table when he said, "Honor your father and your mother, which is the first commandment of the promise. "(Eph. 4:2) How would this commandment be first if God had not engraved it at the head of the second table? Saint Paul says "of the promise", because God adds immediately: "In order that you may be happy and live long on the earth." This is the promise that is made to those who keep the commandments. So here you have the separate commandments, their exact number and the precise indication of those engraved on each table.

#### (Exodus 20:5)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 14. WHY DOES GOD, WHOSE SCRIPTURE PRAISES JUSTICE, THREATEN TO PUNISH THE SINS OF PARENTS THROUGH THEIR CHILDREN UNTIL THE THIRD AND FOURTH GENERATIONS? —** God can neither do nor say any injustice, to doubt it is madness. If, therefore, none of the words of the Lord are removed, but all the elements of the question are carefully put together, the light will give way to the darkness, and one will regard as a trait

of goodness what appeared a sovereign injustice. To remove some of the elements of a question is to show either ignorance or bad faith, it is the work of a man who likes to slander rather than educate himself. But God has threatened, it is true, to pursue the sins of the parents even on their children, but on those who would have only hatred for him, that is to say, who persevere in the iniquity of their children, fathers, would worship idols after their example; for it is declaring itself the enemy of God to attribute to the creature the honor which is due to him alone. Just as the children of the righteous who are righteous themselves ennable a family, where righteousness is transmitted as an inheritance and receive the double glory of their virtues and those of their parents, so also the children of the wicked who inherit their wickedness add to the crimes of their fathers, because they are the children of the wicked and they imitate their guilty examples for the loss of many. God wants to inspire terror here, but his word is true and justified in reason. Who of us, in fact, executes the bad son of a guilty father in the most ludicrous manner? who does not judge worthy of a double reward the virtuous son of a good man? Now, God threatens to exert his vengeance even on the third and fourth generation, because a bad father may have a son who does not walk in his footsteps, while the grandfather will follow him in the path of evil; but he must know that he cannot escape the rigor of this sentence. If, on the contrary, the grandfather does not follow the example of his grandfather, but those of his father, like God's law, like him, let the great grandfather not forget that the sentence may be to extend to him, if he imitates the criminal conduct of his son. In enacting this law, God wished to act upon the impiety of the parents, and to make them recognize the innumerable evils which the idol-worship, so that their affection for their children reminded them at least of the sentiments of religion which they to their Creator, or so that the sons, in the fear of punishment due to the crimes of their fathers, weave profession of obedience to the law of God. But the foolish ones, by an excess of malice, interpret in another sense this divine sentence, saying, "Our fathers have eaten green grapes, and the teeth of the children have been troubled," (Ezek. 13:2) that is to say, assured of impunity, because their children would suffer the penalty due to their sins, they remained insensitive to the spiritual love of God as well as to the natural affection for their children. That is why God says to them through his Prophet: "The son will not die for the father, nor the father for the son, but the soul that has sinned, will die itself. He wants to teach them that it is in vain that they hope for

impunity, but that the sins of fathers will be punished in the person of children, in the sense that they will be more rigorously cheated, because by imitating impiety of their fathers they renewed the example of crimes which they should have erased. After having made known the evils of which idolatry is the source, God immediately adds the picture of the rewards which he reserves to those who love him: "And I have mercy in the following of a thousand generations to those who love me and keep my commandments," (Exod. 20:6), that is, the virtues of the father are rewarded not only in the rear of the grandchildren, but even after a thousand and a thousand generations. Thus, for example, that a man who loves God is of the race of David, whose existence goes back well above a thousand years, he is the object of the mercy of God, and in the necessity he deserves to double the title of receiving this mercy, by his personal fidelity in the service of God, and because he descends from the race of a man who has professed to love God. And it is here that the goodness of God is truly worthy of our praise. His righteousness on those who lower him is only exercised until the third and fourth generations, and not over thousands of generations. If, therefore, iniquity is perpetuated in the fifth generation, his vengeance begins from there to spread again to the third and fourth generation. But this objection will be made to me: The first author of a crime must be more severely punished than the one who merely imitates him. The perpetrator of the crime receives the just punishment due to him; if the children are more rigorously punished, it is the punishment of the parents. If you ask why, I will answer that the knowledge of the law adds to the gravity of sin, as it happened to Lamech and after Lamech himself. There are, however, some who think that the sons bore the penalty due to the crimes of their fathers when they were taken captive in expiation of their crimes, and that they remained there until the fourth generation. If this feeling is true, not only did God not only punish the sins of the fathers over the children who hated him, but also those who loved his name, for among these captives were Daniel, the three children Baruch, Ezekiel, and Ezra, who was born during captivity itself. So we clearly answered the question we had asked ourselves.

**(Exodus 28:26; Deuteronomy 7:14)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 17. WHY DOES THE LAW DECLARE AND ACCURSE THOSE WHO HAVE NOT LEFT POSTERITY IN ISRAEL, WHILE ISAIAH PROMISES THAT NOTHING IS TO BE FEARED FOR THE EUNUCHS WHO CANNOT HAVE CHILDREN? —** The Jews had heard the words of the Prophet in a different sense than he gave them; So it makes them know what the real meaning is. (Isa. 56:3) As he pronounced this sentence against those who transgress the law of God, and to punish them for having abandoned his worship, they were condemned not to marry, and not to leave posterity, the Jews had fallen into the error of seeing as guilty in the eyes of God those who would not take women, or who, while marrying, could not have children, as if God did not ask something other than children; it is the reproach that the prophet Malachi makes to them. Therefore, to console those who were grieved by the false interpretation of his words, teaches them that he who cannot or will not have children, has nothing to fear, provided he observes the law of God. The curse fell only on those who had the power and the will to have children, remained sterile by an effect of the judgment of God, who refused the fruit of creation to those who had only contempt for the Creator. He wanted that, seeing himself condemned to being unable to father children, or to preserve their lives if they had them, to recognize the effects of the wrath of an angry God and to return to him in the feelings of true repentance. Indeed, the holy personages who were eager to have children without being able to obtain them, believed that their sins were their cause and they were deeply afflicted, not knowing that the providence of God reserved them for the accomplishment of his designs. Thus, through divine intervention, Hannah conceived and bore Samuel (1 Sam. 1:20), Elisabeth John the Baptist (Luke 1:24), and the wife of Manoah, Samson. (Judg. 13:24) The spiritual meaning of these words is that one must look upon as cursed those who have not left posterity destined to see God, that is to say, who have not inspired their children, or their servants, or their neighbor, the feelings of fear of God that they themselves would have to teach others on the earth.

**(Exodus 34:29)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 8. WHY DID MOSES, COMING DOWN FROM THE MOUNTAIN WITH THE TABLES OF THE LAW, HAVE A FACE SO BRIGHT THAT IT COULD NOT BE FIXED ON HIM?** — The power that God had given to Moses over sinners was reflected by this mark of honor and by that dazzling face as he descended from the mountain. For it is against the followers that the law was given. So Moses, who had not sinned, appeared surrounded by glory and glory so glorious that the followers could not stop their eyes on him. The Lord wanted to show in his person that sinners are not worthy to see the glory of God. In fact, after the Israelites had melted and worshiped the idol of the golden calf, after Moses had broken the tables upon which the law of God was written, Moses went up a second time on the mountain with new tables, and when he came down with the law God had written there, his face cast such rays of light that the children of Israel and Aaron himself could not stop looking at him because they had sinned. So he spoke to them by putting a veil on his face, for as long as they sinned in their sins, they were unaware of seeing the glory of God. This is why the Apostle says, "When this people is converted to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away," (1 Cor. 3:16), that is, when purified by the grace of God, they will become worthy of to contemplate the glory of God. In breaking the two tables which he had received in the first place, Moses showed the reprobation of this people, who, by their attachment to iniquity, was to render themselves unworthy of divine promises. The law given a second time meant that this people would succeed another who could not take advantage of the law given on the mountain.

## LEVITICUS

(Leviticus 7:1; Jeremiah 7:1)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 103.** HOW DOES THE LORD COMMIT IN LEVITICUS TO OFFER SACRIFICES AND LIBATIONS THAT HE REJECTS IN ANOTHER PLACE? WE READ IN LEVITICUS THAT THE LORD COMMANDED THE ISRAELITES TO OFFER HIM LIBATIONS, SACRIFICES, BURNT OFFERINGS. HOWEVER, THIS IS WHAT HE SAYS TO THEM THROUGH THE MOUTH OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH: "ADD AS MUCH AS YOU PLEASE YOUR BURNT OFFERINGS TO YOUR VICTIMS, AND EAT THE FLESH OF YOUR SACRIFICES, FOR I DID NOT ORDAIN TO YOUR FATHERS, IN THE DAY THAT I TOOK THEM OUT OF EGYPT, TO OFFER ME BURNT OFFERINGS AND VICTIMS." — This question of holocausts and sacrifices, thoroughly examined, cannot cause any difficulty, and the Lord neither contradicted nor changed his prescriptions by revoking a commandment he would have given. In fact, we find no command that relates to the sacrifices, libations, and burnt offerings he speaks of in this place. Remember, then, that there were two kinds of sacrifices; the first included all the sacrifices which God had prescribed for the different circumstances; the other the voluntary sacrifices. God had thus prescribed the various sacrifices that were to be offered either for sins or for the firstborn, and regulated the matter and mode of these sacrifices. But the voluntary sacrifice had not been the object of any command; it was left to the will of everyone who offered what he considered good; these sacrifices were essentially voluntary. But as negligence and recklessness were introduced into these sacrifices and the Jews did not think that the gifts offered to the Almighty should be carefully chosen, God said to them, "I did not command you to offer me these sacrifices, but if you want to offer them, you must choose victims worthy of me." Thus Cain made himself guilty by not thinking that he should offer God the best fruits of the earth. (Gen. 4:6) They claimed to offer these sacrifices to God, to make him favorable,

and they rather attracted his indignation; and far from doing a good work as they boasted, they were guilty of offering to God burnt offerings unworthy of him. This is the reproach he makes them by the prophet Malachi: "If you present a blind or crippling heifer for a sacrifice, is it not an evil?" "Raise it to your master or chief if they please him, or if he welcomes your face, says the Lord Almighty. "(Mal. 1:8) He addresses the same complaints to them by the prophet Isaiah: I have not made for you to seek or purchase incense at great cost, I did not desire the fat of your victims, and you presented them before me covered with your sins and your iniquities." (Isa. 1:11) This is the true motive of these reproaches: they offered voluntary sacrifices to God, but these sacrifices were not homage pleasing to God because they offered him unworthy victims without these sacrifices being obligatory. God had demanded them; necessity could have excused the more or less perfect choice of the victims; but as these sacrifices were voluntary, they had to offer victims that were a testimony of their religion towards God. Their mind was entirely devoted to the false worship of idols; from this negligence in the sacrifices they were taking away from the true God. The Lord therefore reproaches them with a double reproach, of daring to sacrifice to God with a soul soiled by iniquity, and of offering him victims unworthy of him; for the guilty actions are not redeemed by sacrifices, but by the tears and mercy of God. So listen to what David says after his sin: "If you had wanted sacrifices, I would have given you some, but burnt offerings are not pleasing to you. The sacrifice that God requires is a soul broken with pain, God does not disdain a contrite and humiliated heart." What does Samuel say to Saul, who, having despised the Lord's commandments, imagined that he might appease him with a sacrilege? "Does the Lord want sacrifices? Do not you rather ask to obey his voice?" (1 Sam. 15:22) God also says in Scripture, "I prefer mercy rather than sacrifice." (Hos. 6:6) Now the Jews who were without righteousness and without mercy, believed that they might give themselves to God by sacrifices; This is what Christians still do today who, without taking any notice of justice, feel that their offerings make them worthy of praise and reward. The sacrifice made to God is a good thing, but on the condition that justice be observed and the mercy practiced; for we must exercise in regard to others what we ask for ourselves.

## JOSHUA

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT
<p><b>(Joshua 7:24)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 36.</b> IF THE SINNING SOUL ALONE IS TO BE PUNISHED BY THE DEAD, WHY IN THE SIN OF ACHAN, THE SON OF CHARMI, THIRTY MEN WERE SLAIN TO ATONE FOR HIS CRIME? — This word of Scripture must be understood in another sense than that which is given to it. It wanted to speak here not of this death which is common to all, but of that which is called the second death. This death is the punishment reserved for sinners. As for those who were killed in this fight, they did not atone for the sin of Achan, but they were deprived of divine protection that would have made them victorious over their enemies. It was not the sin of Achan that was the cause of their defeat, but they were deprived of the help of God to oppose a brave resistance, and they were put to death, because they were few against a great multitude, and they were overwhelmed by numbers. There is therefore no injustice in the will of God; it is in his power to grant or refuse his assistance; if he grants it, it is an act of mercy; if he refuses it, it is an effect of his justice, for there is not here a debtor strictly obliged to pay what he owes. This is why Joshua, son</p>	<p><b>(Joshua 7:24)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 14.</b> IF THE SINNER ALONE SHOULD DIE IN PUNISHMENT FOR HIS SIN, WHY ARE THIRTY MEN PUT TO DEATH FOR THE PERSONAL SIN OF CHARMI? — As for Charmi, he was guilty, and he was stoned to death. The thirty-six men, on the contrary, who perished in the fight, were not overwhelmed by the weight of divine vengeance, but simply deprived of its aid. It is their weakness, and consequently their lack of resistance, which has been the cause of their death. The sin of Charmi has determined here only one thing, that those who could count on the help of God have been deprived of it. This is why Joshua, son of Nave, was grieved and tore his clothes, because he understood that God, who was his protector, had withdrawn his support in this circumstance.</p>

of Nave, grieved at this failure, uncovered his clothes (Josh. 7:6), because he understood that it was not without reason that God had refused the support of his divine help.	
--	--

## JUDGES

**(Judges 11:39)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 43. SINCE GOD FORBADE ABRAHAM TO SACRIFICE HIS SON, WHY DID HE NOT ALSO DEFEND JEPHTHAH FROM SACRIFICING HIS DAUGHTER? —** There is a big difference between Abraham and Jephthah. At first Abraham had a legitimate birth, while that of Jephthah was illegitimate, for he was the son of a courtesan. Then, Abraham's life was irreproachable; Jephthah was chief of lawbreakers. Abraham was a righteous man and that temptation had felt. Jephthah could not present any testimony of justice. Abraham was therefore commanded to sacrifice his son to God to show men the greatness of his faith in God, since at his command he did not hesitate to sacrifice his son to him. Indeed, he does not doubt for a moment that he who, against all human hope, could have given birth to this child of a sterile and advanced woman could not, against the laws of nature, resuscitate him from among the dead. This obedience was the height of Abraham's righteousness, for God saw then that he did not ask for the blood of this child, but that he only wanted by this commandment to put the last line to the virtue of his servant, he submits those who love him to certain trials to motivate the just rewards he has for them. Jephthah, on the other hand, a man without virtue and without foresight, by a sentiment of religion misunderstood, promises a sacrifice to God in these words: "I will offer a burnt

offering to God the first to come out of the door of my house and come in front of me when I come back from the fight." (Judg. 11:31) Was he forced to do this? or did he understand how he was to perform it? What would he have done if he had introduced to him a dog, a donkey, which the law forbids offering to the Lord, or the son or wife of another? Would he have fulfilled his vow by rejoicing at the expense of others' pain? The judgment of God, therefore, allowed this vow, the improvidence of which might be so fatal to others, to fall back on itself; and Jephthah pushed blindness until he did not recognize that he had made a reckless wish and that he had to go back on the erroneous promise of which he was the author. He ought to have understood that God cannot accept a similar sacrifice, request for his reckless conduct, and offer to God a victim who was not contrary to the law; but he likes to become better parricide by remaining faithful to his vow, without recollecting that truth which a reckless and foolish promise, in order to be useful, can only be fatal. He sacrificed himself by immolating his daughter, so God concealed his disapproval of such a sacrifice. If he had positively forbidden it, he would have seemed to want another victim to be sacrificed to him, while he knew that Jephthah was unworthy and could not offer it to him. As for her daughter, death was a gain for her, because in dying as an innocent victim of her father's guilty wish, she avoided the pain of hell to which she might not have been able to escape by prolonging her life. If we see the triumph crowning the efforts of Jephthah, let us beware of attributing it to his own merit or that of his army, for we do not read that they prayed to God to give them a defender. Besides, had God given this mission to Jephthah? had he spoken to him? No, but as the foreign nations exalted the power of their gods, as if they had subjected them to the children of Rael and had only insults for the God of Abraham, God exercised his vengeance against these natives not for his people, who was unworthy of it, but for the honor of his name in view of the merits of Abraham and for his sanctuary. So when we see the spirit of God seize Samson, who gave himself up to a courtesan, shall we say that he was worthy? No, but this grace was given to him only for the destruction of enemy nations. (Judg. 14:6; 15:14)

## 1 SAMUEL

(**1 Samuel 7:9**)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 46.** WAS SAMUEL ONE OF AARON'S CHILDREN, AND SHOULD IT BE ADMITTED THAT HE WAS A PRIEST? — There are some among us who, busy with worldly affairs or little zeal for the study of the Holy Scriptures, support this erroneous view that Samuel was a priest, that is to say, descendant of Aaron, whose sons, according to God's command, were born and did not priests. They had only the privilege of offering incense on the altar. Others push the error further; they admit that Samuel was not of the race of Aaron, that is to say, he was not born a priest, and they do not fail to affirm that he has fulfilled the priestly functions. It is to these that we must first answer, for it is more absurd to affirm that Samuel fulfilled the priestly functions without being born a priest than to maintain that he was a priest as a descendant of Aaron. On one side there is only ignorance, on the other there is unreason. When we have proved to those who think that Samuel was born a priest that he was not of the race of Aaron, they will be convinced that he was not clothed with the priesthood, for they seem to be ignorant that the children of Aaron were permitted to perform the priestly functions, a truth of which Scripture gives us clear evidence. Thus Korah, who was not Aaron's children, who wanted to offer incense on the altar, the earth opened under his feet and swallowed him up with those who had joined him. (Num. 16:31) And Uzziah the king, who was also not of the tribe of Aaron, but of the tribe of Judah, having dared to usurp the priestly offices by appearing before the altar, was struck with leprosy on the forehead and remained leprous until the day of his death. (2 Kgs. 15:5; 2 Chron. 26:21) As for those who claim that Samuel, without being a priest by right of birth, did not fail to fulfill his functions, their opinion is rather unreasonable, and it is not a mediocre job to persuade the truth to a fool. What, indeed, is their folly to maintain that it is night while the sun pours streams of light on the earth? They read, and not in one right, that God established by law that the functions of the priesthood would be exclusively reserved for Aaron and his children, and they stubbornly maintain that Samuel was a priest. They do not

understand that if Samuel fulfilled the priestly functions, without holding this right of his birth, he is a usurper, because God has established that this right would come from birth, and not from the will of men. It is even more than boldness to conceive this opinion of Samuel. How can one suppose, indeed, that a man so worthy of esteem, so commendable to the very testimony of God, would have dared to seize functions which he knew were forbidden to him? Besides, he does not know with what rigor God has more than once celebrated this recklessness. He could not claim that dignity by a special concession of God, which he knew to be undisputable in his decrees, and if this concession had been made to him, he would have rather regarded it as a temptation, in the belief that it was that God could not in any way return to what He had established. He would have thought rather that it was the devil who granted him this right under the appearance and in the name of God, to believe that God had changed his decrees. When God forbade Balaam to go to Balac and asked him again if he could go to the invitation that was made to him (Num. 22:19), God, angry with him, he took it again by the mouth of an angel, for this animal, seeing the angel who was opposing his passage, no longer wished to advance. Now, Balaam, asking God again, who had forbidden him to undertake this journey, if he consented to his departure, judged of God as of a man who, by the same as he cannot foresee the future, is changeable and variable in his designs. But Balaam has no testimony from heaven for him, for he was a diviner. Samuel, on the contrary, was a man loved by God, and knowing the invariability of his decrees; how could he have believed that he was permitted to act against such a clearly established law? It was, they say, after the death of Heli and his sons, who were priests, that Samuel began to fulfill the priestly functions. That's what history does not say, that's what reason cannot admit. Those who advance this opinion are obliged to suppose that there was then no one who could exercise the priestly functions, and that after the death of Eli and his two sons, the priesthood would have ceased to exist if Samuel had not sacrificed himself to God. Such a feeling is offensive to God, because those who support him seem to accuse him of improvidence by instituting a ministry which could not have duration. Why, indeed, establish that none other than the children of Aaron could perpetually fulfill the priestly functions until the time of the advent of Christ, if he knew that this priesthood should fail? If, on the contrary, he did not know it (and far from us this thought), he was therefore without foresight, then he could also be made that in the

absence of these legitimate priests Samuel did not exercise the functions of the priesthood. But if one is forced to admit the providence and prescience of God, what he has established must have remained, and if so, Samuel did not exercise the priesthood, because he was not a priest. In the old law, indeed, and according to the established order of God, the priesthood was attached to birth; in the news, God has established that the priests would be instituted. Let them choose one of these two things, whether they prove that Samuel was born a priest or that he became a priest. Now they confess that he is not born a priest, because they know that he is not of the family of Aaron. So if Samuel is not a priest by birth, and if we do not read, if we cannot prove that God had prescribed to establish priests apart from the family of Aaron, the rigorous conclusion Samuel was not a priest. Nevertheless, the contradicts persist in closing their eyes to the evidence; or, they say, Samuel was not a priest, but he fulfilled the functions, since we read that he offered a sacrifice to God. (1 Sam. 7:9-10) Who will dare to oppose this testimony of the holy books? Yes, Samuel offered a sacrifice to God, but it does not follow that he exercised the priestly ministry. It is said every day that a man offers a sacrifice when he hands over to the priest the victims whom he places on the altar; and it is in this sense that Samuel offered it himself, that is, through the priest, as is done every day. Scripture also says of David, Solomon, and so many others, that they have sacrificed, are we to say that all have performed priestly functions? The priest, it is true, performs his own ministry, yet the very act of sacrifice is attributed to him in whose name the priest sacrificed, in other words, he is attributed to the one who presents the sacramental victims. How, indeed, he who was not a priest could have held the place of a priest? Can a deacon replace a priest? A prefect may replace a prefect, a lender take the place of a lender, but a private man cannot replace any authority; how much less can one who is not a priest replace a priest? For what purpose could he aspire to the exercise of a ministry which he knows to be forbidden to him? If a priest comes to fail in one place, or ask another to come and replace him; but no prophet, no saint, will ever do a thing that he knows to be forbidden to him. A holy life, indeed, does not carry the power to exercise any ministry. Just as the priest cannot base on his character alone the esteem he wants us to make of his life; he whose life is holy and the pure manners cannot hope to find there the right to exercise the priestly ministry. The priesthood is a good institution, it is true, but it becomes an evil thing for the one who pretends to

exercise it without any right. If we carefully consider what is written by Samuel, we shall see that testimony testifies to him the Scripture: "And all the people knew," he said, "that Samuel was the faithful prophet of the Lord." (1 Sam. 3:20) And in the book of Psalms: "May Moses and Aaron be his priests, and Samuel the number of those who call on his name." (Ps. 98:6) Who does not see this distinction that these characters are separated by their different dignities; that is to say, we see Moses and Aaron clothed with priestly dignity, and Samuel, among the prophets, is deemed worthy to invoke by his prayers the protection of God over his people, as he did indeed. (1 Sam. 7:9) - The priests, moreover, were so little lacking, that when the ark was brought back from the Philistines, carried by the Levites, the inhabitants of Bethsamea offered sacrifices to God in Samuel's absence; and when Saul became king, Ahimaas, grandson of the high priest Heli, wore the ephod. Now, they will say, it is precisely the proof that Samuel was a priest, for he was clothed with the ephod. But are today deacons not clothed with dalmatics like the bishops? We also read that David was clothed with the ephod (2 Sam. 6:14), and a double ephod. Samuel, still a tiny child, was himself wearing the ephod (1 Sam. 6:18), Could he at this age offer to God the gifts of the people? You see, then, that this name of ephod has different meanings. The priests wore the ephod, but did not wear it, while it was the garment. The ephod means sometimes a garment, sometimes a kind of ornament that the priests wore to consult the Lord. So far as we seem, we proved that Samuel was not a priest, but a prophet. We now have to answer those who think that Samuel was a priest, because they do not know that Samuel was not one of Aaron's children, for it was not permissible for a descendant of Aaron not to practice the priestly ministry. I want to prove to them first of all that if Samuel was a priest, his father Helcana undoubtedly had to be, as well as the sons of Samuel. Now, a proof that they were not priests, is that he made them judges over the children of Israel, as Samuel himself was. We read "that he judged the children of Israel." Helcana, Samuel's father, was not a priest either, because, says the Scripture: "He went from the city called Ramathaim to the ordained days to worship the Lord and offer sacrifices to the almighty God of hosts, and there were the two sons of Heli, Ophni and Phinehas, priests of the Lord." (1 Sam. 1:3) Can it be more clearly established that at the appointed time, Elenahana offered sacrifices to the Lord by the hand of the priests, according to the prescriptions of Moses, according to which the Hebrews were to offer victims and tithes of their

property three times a year, where was the ark and the priests of the Lord? Besides, he had two women at the same time, which was forbidden to priests. Indeed, Helcana was one of the Levites, as indicated by the following genealogies in the book Chronicles. (1 Chron. 6) The Levites did not yet have specific functions to fulfill with the priests and the ark of the Lord. David, during his reign, thus divides the sacred functions between priests and Levites. From the age of twenty and above, and according to the law for twenty-five years and above, they had to begin to minister in sacred ceremonies. He instituted among the children of Aaron, that is to say among the descendants of Phinees and Thamar, twenty-four classes of priests to perform alternately their ministry at certain times. He also appointed Levites to be porters of the tabernacle, to carry the ark of the Lord, to guard the holy place and sacred vessels, and to receive the mass of offerings. He also instituted twenty-four classes of cantors, harp players, and other musicians, who filled their offices in their turn, because they had to be allowed some rest and time to take care of their household affairs. Now, not only do these details contribute to establish the truth that we seek to prove, that is, Samuel was not Aaron's children, but the very promise his mother made to the Lord is a new proof: "If you give me a son," she told him, "I will give it to the Lord every day of my life." (1 Sam. 1:11) Now she would not have spoken this language if he had been a priest by right of birth; it would have been necessarily devoted to the service of the altars. But he was only Levite, and there was still no special law for the Levites; each one did what he wanted, and often they engaged in the paths of error and iniquity. Thus Jonathan, the grandson of Moses, who was among the Levites, took it upon himself to attribute the priesthood to the tribe of Dan. This is why we read in the book of Judges, "At that time there was no king in Israel; but everyone did everything that seemed good to him." (Judg. 17:6) And so Hannah consecrated Samuel to God, saying, "I put this child into the hands of the Lord" so that he would not be exposed to going astray like the others. Finally, to deal with this question in all its aspects, let us still discuss what is said of Helcana, and that he came to ordinary days to offer sacrifices and tithe of his goods. How could he offer the tithe of his goods since he possessed nothing? For the Levites had no part in the division of the lands, because they were to live on tithes which the people gave them. But it can be done, and this opinion is based, that he possessed the property of his wife or others that he would have bought, because not only the Levites, but the others and the priests

themselves were taking wives in other tribes. Thus we see the High Priest Jehoiada take for wife the daughter of King Joram, of the tribe of Jude. (2 Chron. 22:11)

### **(1 Samuel 15:24; 2 Samuel 12:13)**

#### **1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 18.** WHY DID SAUL AFTER HIS SIN, ASK THAT GOD BE PRAISED, FOR FORGIVENESS WITHOUT BEING ABLE TO OBTAIN IT, WHILE DAVID, ALSO A SINNER, ASKED FOR IT AND OBTAINED IT? —

It is not appropriate to revise the judgments of God; it is at the school of these judgments that the weakness or ignorance of men must learn from what they do not understand, and convince themselves that they are the expression of truth; therefore God must not have acted otherwise than He has acted, since we know that there is no acceptance of persons in him. (Acts 10:34) He answered David's prayer, he rejected that of Saul, he did not commit any injustice in it. He knew in what internal dispositions each of them prayed to him. He therefore answered the prayer of one who implored his pardon with a contrite and humbled heart, and rejected the prayer of him who had closed his soul to all repentance. God, in fact, gives more attention to the feelings of the heart than to the words that come from the mouth; he declares it in his own words: "Man," he says, "sees what appears, but God looks at the heart." (1 Sam. 16:7) What misleads us is that we leave ourselves to deceive by the pretense of language or a lying exterior, because we cannot see what is going on in the heart. We must therefore follow the judgment of God who examines men in the most intimate of the heart, where the real feelings are. This is what the Savior himself did, as we see in the Gospel. He does not wish to receive among his disciples a scribe who offers himself to him (Matt. 8:19), and he calls after him Levi who sat in the house of the tax-collectors (Matt. 9:17; Mark 2:14, Luke 5:27), because the feelings of this scribe were not in harmony with his words; Levi, on the other hand, without saying a single word, had in his heart what the scribe had only on his lips. Now Jesus, according to what is written, knew what is in man (Jn. 2:25), chooses Levi. Moreover, David did not ask as Saul, but he implored his forgiveness in the feelings of a heart deeply contrite and humiliated.

### **(1 Samuel 26:16)**

#### **1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 35. HOW CAN DAVID STILL CALL SAUL THE ANOINTED OF THE LORD, AND DO HIM HONOR IN THIS EXCELLENCE AFTER THE LORD HAD DEPARTED FROM HIM?** — David was not unaware that the royal dignity was of divine origin, and as long as he sees Saul clothed with this dignity, he honors him in this excellence so as not to appear to be wanting to God who does a duty of these honors to the respect of kings. The king, indeed, is the image of God, as the bishop is the image of Christ. As long as he occupies this high rank, he must be honored, if not for himself, at least for the dignity with which he is clothed. This is the Apostle's recommendation: "Be subject to the higher powers. There is no power that is not of God, and those that are, have been ordained of God." (Rom. 13:1) This is why we honor a pagan man constituted in dignity, though personally unworthy of him, who, taking God's place, pays his homage to the devil. Power is entitled to the honors we pay him and he deserves them. This is why God revealed in dreams to Pharaoh his future years of famine (Gen. 42:26), and that only of all those who were present with him he saw the Son of God in the fiery furnace (Dan. 3), thanks, no doubt, to his personal merits, he who wished to be adored in an idol, but to the excellence of the royal dignity with which he was clothed.

## 2 SAMUEL

(**2 Samuel 28:12**)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 27.** DID THE WITCH MENTIONED SAMUEL; DID HE REALLY APPEAR BEFORE HER, AND DID HE SAY TO SAUL THE WORDS WHICH THE BOOK OF KINGS RELATES? — This fact seems to me scarcely worthy if one sticks to the simple words of the historical narrative. How can one admit that the power of magical art has forced the appearance of a man as holy in his works as in his birth? or that without being forced to it he appeared voluntarily? It is absurd to admit one or the other of these suppositions in this just man. If he has been mentioned in spite of himself, then justice has no power; if he consented to this evocation, he lost the merit of these virtues he had practiced during his mortal life; absurd consequence, for he who comes out of this life into righteousness perseveres in it. Now Satan's tricks go so far that to deceive a greater number he wants to appear to hold the good under his power. This is what the Apostle wants us to hear through these words: "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." (2 Cor. 11:14) In order to accredit an error which turned to his glory, he disguised himself under the exterior and the name of a righteous man, to show thus the little foundation of the hope given to the servants from God, since the righteous who came out of this life were subject to his own child. Some are deceived here because he has told the truth about the death of Saul and his sons, as if it were difficult for the devil to foresee before death and the death of the body, especially since warning signs are manifested to those whose death is near, because the protection of God seems to have withdrawn from them. How much more must we suppose this knowledge in the devil, whose prophetic oracles retrace to us the sublime dignity above all the angels and of which the Apostle said: "Do you therefore ignore the heights of Satan?" (Rev. 2:24, 2 Cor. 2:11) How is it astonishing that he could have foreseen the death of Saul, when this prediction served to deceive men and to be adored as clothed in his power? Saul pushed madness and stupidity to resort to the enchantments of a witch. The depreciation of his heart made him use sacrilegious means which he himself had condemned.

If, out of respect for history, we do not think we ought to pass lightly on the literal account of the facts, we will be right, provided we do not conclude with the reality of these facts, but only with what impresses on the eyes and mind. Saul, reprobate of God, could not have a true and righteous spirit. The historian describes the provisions of Saul and the exterior of Samuel; he recounts the words that were said, the appearances that are glaring in the eyes, but without saying whether these appearances are in conformity with the truth or not. What does he say, indeed? Saul, learning in what form appeared the one he had asked, "understood that it was Samuel." (1 Sam. 28:14) The historian tells what was Saul's thought, and how that thought was not good. He adored another than God against the defense of Scripture, in the thought that it was Samuel, and he adored the devil, who thus collected the fruit of his tricks; for the purpose of all his efforts is to be adored as God. If Samuel had really appeared to Saul, this righteous man would not have allowed him to be worshiped, he who had taught that adoration was only due to God alone. How besides this man of God was with Abraham, in the abode of happiness, could he say to that guilty man worthy of the flames of hell: "You will be with me tomorrow"? Satan betrays here doubly the subtlety of his tricks; he allows us to worship him under the exterior and the name of Samuel against the express defense of the law, and in spite of the immense distance which separates the sinners from the just, he falsely proves to a man charged with iniquities that he will share the happiness of the most just of men. These words would be true if Samuel's name were not mixed in, because in reality Saul had to be with the devil. He went to find the one he had loved. The demon may disguise himself, but he is always betrayed by actions contrary to the character of the persons whose instruments he wishes to deceive.

## 1 KINGS

(1 Kings 3; 11)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 18.** WHY IS SOLOMON IN THE SPIRIT OF WISDOM, ALTHOUGH HIS MANNERS WERE FAR FROM PURE, SINCE HE WAS DOMINATED BY THE UNREGULATED LOVE OF WOMEN? — Solomon first received the spirit of wisdom for his personal conduct; and after he had abandoned himself to the disordered and criminal love of women, if he still had this spirit of wisdom, it was in the interest of his kingdom; and it was for the same reason that Nebuchadnezzar saw Jesus Christ in the furnace.

## 2 KINGS

(2 Kings 2:10)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 26.** DID ELISHA GET WHAT HE ASKED INDISCREETLY FOR ELIJAH? — Elisha eagerly desired the spirit and the gift of miracles; seduced by the example of his master who allowed him to ask him anything he wished, and greedy of the good he could obtain, he asked for a double portion of the spirit that Elijah had. The man of God answered him: "You asked me a very difficult thing." An intense desire made him forget that the disciple is not above the master. (Matt. 10:24) However, Elijah, knowing well that it was not by the ambition of the glory of this world that he had made this request, replied: "Nevertheless, if you see me

when I will be removed from you, you will have what you asked for." The meaning of these words requires serious attention. Elijah, whose dissatisfaction pierces in these words: "You ask me a very difficult thing," does not fail to add: "If, however, you see me when I am taken away from you, you will have what you have asked for." He had not refused him an absolute refusal, he only taught him that he would obtain according to his merit rather than according to his request. Scripture, in fact, means that many things must be understood so that the meaning which results from the expressions is not contrary to the principles of religion. This indiscreet request must have had no effect; but because Elisha reads it only by the desire of good, God, who knows what he ought to give to each, would not be deprived of the goods which he was worthy of receiving. Let us now see if Elijah deserved to have Elisha receive a double portion of the spirit that he himself had. The Holy Spirit made known to Zechariah what would be the greatness and merit of John. "He will come," said he, "in the spirit and virtue of Elijah. (Luke 1:17) He tells him that John will be the equal of Elijah, and Our Lord says on his side: "No one has risen from the children of women greater than John the Baptist. (Matt. 11:11.) He does not say, He is greater than all, but: "No one is greater than he;" That is, one can be his equal, one cannot be superior to him. Elijah is therefore equal to him, and is not inferior to anyone; How can Elisha be greater than he, since John, who has no one above him, is equal to Elijah? For when he arrived on the banks of the Jordan, the waters would not yield to his word to give him passage, if he had not invoked the name of Elijah (2 Kgs. 2:14), God not wanting to let him believe that he had received the effect of his indiscreet request, because the measure of the spirit which had been accorded to Elijah was not sufficient for the time he lived.

## TOBIT

### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 119. ON TOBIT.** — The providence of the Lord God towards us is so great that, not wanting us to err, he gave us the law and examples of good works, so that, following them, one may lead an honest and peaceful life with the fear of God. For he who is the maker of life naturally does not wish his work to be subject to death. Although nature itself is not devoid of law, the Lord, being good and merciful, wanted us to have greater knowledge of the things to be pursued and of the things to be avoided, and to this end he showed them through texts and examples, as the present reading attests. Therefore God's servant holy Tobit was given to us, after the law, as an example, so that we may know how the things we have read are done, and so that, if trials come, we may not desist from the fear of God, and that we may not hope for help from any other source than from him, keeping in mind that it is written, "I have been young, and now am old; and I have not seen the just forsaken, nor his seed seeking bread" (Ps. 36:25). Therefore he who hopes in God with all his mind can never be deceived. Even if tribulations arise for a time through Satan's maneuvers, the examples of holy men teach us that these things are permitted by God only for the sake of increasing our rewards; because if we bear tribulations with composure, we shall here be given consolation with effect, and in the future we shall be given eternal life with glory. For because our God is just and there is no respect of persons with him (Rom. 2:11), he lets us be tested, because he loves us, so that he may give us immense rewards after the hardship. Indeed, when the apostle was praying for his trials to cease, the Lord said to him, "My grace is sufficient for you; for power is made perfect in infirmity". As a reaction to this the apostle said, "When I am weak, then am I stronger", and "I rejoice in my tribulations," he said, "that the power of Christ may dwell in me" (2 Cor. 12:9-10). So, let us be informed by the Scripture of how praiseworthy holy Tobit is, whose devotion captivity did not diminish, whom the loss of his eyes did not stop from blessing God, whom the exhaustion of his resources did not divert from the way of justice and truth (Tob. 1-3). Indeed, need tests a just man and proves him to be just, and keeping fairness when in poverty is the true and perfect

justice. From things that diminish the devotion of some, praiseworthy Tobit gained an increase of it. For want, he says, humiliates a man, and he who is humiliated cannot keep justice. But holy Tobit's spirit, intent on God, was neither broken by captivity nor humiliated by want, because he buried the bodies of the slain in spite of the prohibition, and, certain of God's generosity, he was compassionate even with the small means that he had, knowing that God prefers the compassion that is done from small means, as did the widow whom the Lord praised in the Gospel (Luke 21:2-4). For the truly faithful person, the person who does not doubt God's promises, is the one who gives generously from little. Therefore, comforting his heart with the hope of the future, Tobit, devoted to God, was found to be strong and brave in trial, showing that, when in want, one ought to be all the more vigilant in God's fear, because if want does not prompt you to seek God's help, how much less will security? Therefore holy men, certain that God has reserved for himself the judgement of all that is done in this world, not only have not been vexed about tribulations, losses, and other calamities or reproaches, but they have even accepted them with gratitude, as did our apostles, who after being beaten rejoiced that they had been accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Christ (Acts 5:41). Indeed, the calamities that unjustly strike the faithful, whether in tribulations or in reproaches, are the signs of future rewards. Therefore just Tobit was so pleasing to God that he obtained for his merits a twofold reward: for the present he recovered, through the angel's agency, the sight that he had lost, and was also enriched with the resources that are useful in this life; and for the future he was made an heir of the kingdom of heaven: so that we might be taught through this that when someone obeys God's law with all their heart and does not doubt his promises, God often augments their resources in this world, and grants them eternal life in the next. There is also something else that invites us to compliance with God's law: holy Tobit did not only obtain the rewards of his own justice, because there is added to the sum of his glory also something from the good actions of those who behave as his imitators. For examples are praised in their imitators. This can happen to us as well if we live in such a way that it becomes appropriate for us to have imitators too.

(Tobit 12:7)

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT

**QUESTION 8.** IT IS WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF TOBIT, "IT IS HONORABLE TO REVEAL AND TO CONFESS THE WORKS OF GOD;" WHILE THE SAVIOR, AFTER DOING THE WORK OF GOD, RECOMMENDS NOT TO TELL IT TO ANYONE. (MARK 8:26) — The Savior did not recommend hiding the work of God, because he says in another place, "Go, and tell the great things that God did for you" (Mark 5:19), but he sometimes refused the testimony that men wanted to give him and repressed their vanity, so as not to appear to testify to himself, as a seducer, unreasonable conduct in the eyes of every prudent man.

## JOB

### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 118. ON JOB.** — How great, my dear brothers, is the love of Almighty God for mankind; when it is well understood it serves to lead men into the kingdom of heaven; for want of understanding it, on the contrary, we go down into the underworld. God wants His graces to be pleasing and fruitful to us; he wants us to find our advantage and to satisfy his desire to have mercy. It is therefore because of his goodness and that will that he has all men saved that he has given us an example of perfect justice in the person of his servant Job, as you are taught by the reading we have just done. By imitating this example we will be freed from evil, and we will be able to attain the highest good, and not only be delivered from punishment, but obtain eternal rewards. How admirable is this holy patriarch Job, who even before the written law, shows in his works an accomplished example of

the observance of the law, and who, without having been to the school of any master, under the inspiration of nature in which God has engraved the first principles of justice, has preserved for his Creator a religion full of devotion and obedience. What praises is he not worthy, and by what words can we celebrate the works of this man, of whom we cannot find the like, neither before nor after the law? A man can walk in his footsteps, but he cannot enter into comparison with him, nor can it be said that he is like him, for he did not open the way this way first, he only follows the one who preceded it. The holy man Job, on the contrary, has shown himself such without ever having seen, having never read anything of the kind; he did not imitate the conduct of others; it is he, on the contrary, who becomes their model and gives them the example of those admissible actions in which God Himself finds his complaisance. So the Lord himself gave him this glorious testimony: "Have you noticed my servant Job," he said to Satan? "that there is not a servant of God like him on the earth. (Job 1:8.) Who could have deserved the extraordinary privilege that the Lord bore witness to him, except he who did not imitate the example of another, but who walked first in the way he entered? Then we conclude that he worshiped God in truth. There is no semblance of truth as such in the one who has not been preceded by no one in the way he walks. Any man who wants to pretend the fact in things where he is only imitator. And yet what remains to be said is far superior to these first merits. In these virtues so praiseworthy, we do not see the trials of tribulations, but a soul inviolably attached to the service of God, and a loyalty to any test in the observance of his law. The tempter did not find that the measure was full enough to obtain the crown which rewards the merits; he therefore asked God to subject Job's virtue to various temptations, to enslave him and embarrass him in the bonds of misfortune and drag him beyond the bounds. As no man can bear the weight of all the torments together, the guilty are subjected to separate tortures to extract from them the confession of their crimes. God therefore allowed the tempter to destroy all that belonged to his servant, and to destroy everything to his children. The devil hoped that if Job bore the loss of his oxen without complaining, he would not bear the loss of his flocks of sheep, or at least the loss of his camels, of his servants, of all his riches; or, finally, that if he had a soul large enough and a religion so pure as not to succumb to these calamities, his soul would be overcome by paternal tenderness and broken heart when he learned that all his children had died as victims by the same disaster.

But as before even the proclamation of the written law, he carried the law engraved in his heart, none of these flames, none of these losses did not weaken the deep feeling of religion which he professed for God, and he thus gave to all men the example of loving God with all their heart above all things. What glory, then, is not he who, before the law, observed the law faithfully, and who, before this law was given to men, taught them not by his words, but by his actions, how they should observe him? Now the tempter pushed his boldness so far as not to find sufficient for the glory of this just man, so many misfortunes united; he therefore wished to subject him to a more terrible trial, which he knew to be above the forces of man; he asked God again that he allowed him to strike Job with a frightful ulcer from head to foot. (Job 2:5) God allowed him; but as this spirit of malice must not be trusted, he commanded him to respect Job's soul, and not to use violence against him whose reason he could not overcome. No sooner had he received this power than by a more violent excess of cruelty he struck this just man with a horrible disease, so that his whole body was not a wound, which could never have been borne another than Job, who won a complete victory over Satan. As this cruelty of the devil could not snatch from this holy man the slightest murmur against God, Satan remembered the trick he had used formerly to deceive Adam; he tried to shake Job's loyalty with his wife, for one is generally more accessible to the seductions that come from within. But none of these means succeeds in this spirit of boldness; he found there only a new and shameful defeat; but the servant of God alone remained steadfast, but he kept a school of virtue. In this end of all evils, he did not content himself with persevering in the fear of God, but he severely reproved his wife, who wished to inspire him with contrary sentiments, and showed him that we must bear with courage all the events which only arrive by God's permission. It was a double punishment for Satan who was thus deceived in his predictions; he could not shake Job's loyalty as he wished, and his envy only led him to teach others what the devil did not want him to know himself. Indeed, this story fully teaches us how much temptation is useful to the servants of God, and fatal to the devil. While he hopes to be able to harm them, he makes the faith more brilliant, and the example of one persecuted by him becomes for many an eloquent exhortation to virtue. The protection of God, who surrounds the righteous in the midst of his trials, gives him a great number of imitators. The devil loses by wanting to win. Always his fury is harmful to him. He persecutes the righteous to

make them lose their crown, and he only makes them more fortifications. Envy excites him against the holy man Job, and he only doubled his reward in heaven and on earth. God more than ever filled Job with all good things, and gave him a place in heaven by the Savior. Thus all these trials turn to the glory of the saints and to the punishment of the devil.

## PSALMS

### (Psalm 1)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 110. ON THE FIRST PSALM.** — "Blessed is the man who did not stop in the way of sinners." If he stops there, he stops being blessed to become guilty and worthy of punishment. Yet he still retains some hope of amendment, because he is not impious, but simply sinful. If a man is found who has not entered the council of the wicked and has not stopped in the way of sinners, he is doubly blessed. For he cannot be blessed, if without entering into the counsel of the wicked, he stops in the path of sinners, because if he does not then have a complete ruin, he is nevertheless worthy of punishment. The Psalmist adds: "nor sits in the seat of scoffers." Happiness, according to him, consists of these three degrees together, and is based on a triple reason, not to enter the counsel of the ungodly, not stopping in the path of sinners, nor sits in the seat of scoffers, but, as we see in the first two degrees only two kinds of people, the ungodly and the sinners to whom this third degree applies: "Nor sits in the seat of scoffers?" Is it to the impious or the sinners? Let us first see what it is to sit in the seat of scoffers, and then we will understand better who this last line applies to. We call the seat of scoffers that which arises outside the order of God, which has been established only to issue unjust judgments, and that is called the scoffers chair, because from it comes the

corruption that causes death, as the iniquity produces damnation. This seat cannot therefore come from God. Moses was established in a chair of life, God raised this seat to retain the authority of the righteous Judge and the Creator God. This is what makes Our Lord say: "The scribes and Pharisees sit on the chair of Moses." (Matt. 23:2) And to the Apostle: "There is no power that is not of God, and those that are, have been ordained of God." (Rom. 13:1) Also see what the same Apostle said to the high priest: "You are sitting to judge me according to the law, and against the law you command me to be struck." (Acts 23:3) These words, "According to the law," show the just and holy authority of the law; and those which follow: These words, "According to the law," show the just and holy authority of the law; and those that follow: "And against the law; you order me to be hit," the injustice of the judge, who even in the seat of God rendered his judgments of iniquity. We read in the prophet Daniel: "The kingdoms belong to God, and he gives them to whom he pleases." (Dan. 4:14) Just as the authority of a king of the earth imposes itself upon all his subjects and inspires them with the respect due to him, so according to the divine institution, the authority God is personified in the king and exerted through him on all men. Often, it is true, the world does not understand this truth, and submits to powers other than those which God has established; yet the divine institution is that only one has the right to the respect and homage of men. The authority of one God is never rejected except by those who teach men to fear and respect many gods. These are those who sit in the chair of scoffers, for the doctrine that their priests preach is a doctrine of death. All their efforts tend to make the worshipers of one God devoted to scorn or death as fools and enemies. This is the object of their impiety, and it still extends to other crimes which bring out all the enormity. Thus, it was by the order of Jezebel that priests of iniquity seated themselves in the seat of scoffers, to wreak the loss of the innocent Naboth, and by means of false suborned witnesses, pronounced against him, without being his judges, a sentence of death. (2 Kgs. 21:11) This is why it is written in another Psalm: "I will not sit with the wicked." (Ps. 25:5) The judgment is here of the same nature as the one who sits in the seat of scoffers. If those who sit in the pulpit of God come to oppress the innocent, their judgment is unjust, but not the seat. But from the seat of scoffers, only iniquitous judgments can come forth, although they cover them with certain appearances which disguise their impiety and deceive the eyes. That impiety alone is proposed, it will find no buyer, and if the preachers of

the doctrine of the devil come to pronounce his name, they make horror. In order to disguise the poison, honey is added to it; they mix with the doctrine of the devil some proverbs of justice, which they cover with the name of truth. We must therefore examine here the intentions and the thought of each, because often he states a truth to better illusion, and thus allow its pernicious errors. We have affirmed that the seat of scoffers was outside the institution of God, and therefore we call seats of scoffers those who are raised outside of the Church or against the Church. A reckless presumption in the use of permitted things is a crime. How much more is the overthrow of the tradition of the one whose siege is seized? In fact, they destroy the order which we see beginning at the Apostle St. Peter, and which has continued to us by an unbroken succession of bridges; they assume a dignity without origin, that is to say, they present a body without head, their seat is therefore rightly called a seat of scoffers. And that they do not count on liberty, because they cover themselves here with the name of God. We know in fact that they put their opposition under the protection of the name of God. Surely it is not the zeal of God that presses them, they just want to defend their places. Now, we know that Korah and the two hundred and fifty Israelites who dared to offer a rash incense to God were swallowed up by the earth that opened under their feet (Num. 16:31-35), and that King Uzziah having wanted to seize priestly functions against the law, was struck on the brow of leprosy. (2 Kgs. 15:5, 2 Chron. 26:21) It is therefore well established that the seat of scoffers is that impiety of which we have just spoken. Let's see what happens next. The Psalmist adds: "But who puts his will into the law of the Lord." (Psalm 1:2) His will is in the law of the Lord, because he despises the ungodly, separates himself from the sinners and the seat of scoffers, and puts all his affection in the law of God. So the Psalmist proclaims him blessed. He adds, "And he meditates on this law day and night." It is evident that free from all seductions, free from all that is opposed to the law of God, he is continually exercised in the practice of this law, and fortunate by the sacraments of the Son of God, he consecrates the day to good works and night to prayer. It is from him of whom it is said in the Song of Songs, "Let him sleep, but let his heart watch." (Songs 5:2) So the Psalmist adds: "And he shall be like a tree planted by a stream of water." Who can doubt that he who makes the law of God the subject of his meditations, has no certain hope? As a tree planted along the water cannot remain barren, so he who continually meditates on the law of God is certain to see the

blessings of his works. "And he will bear fruit in his time." Says the Psalmist, "Every well-directed plantation gives fruits in its time," so he who obeys the law of God will also produce fruit at the appointed time, and will receive the fruit of his zeal and devotion when Our Lord Jesus Christ will begin to judge the living and the dead, and the Psalmist adds, "And his leaves will not fall." This tree whose leaves do not fall clearly signifies the sap of life of which it is full. It is the running water that sprinkles and feeds him that he must keep his leaves. Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "If you treat green wood like this, what will dry wood be made of?" (Luke 23:31) Green wood is here the symbol of life and the fruits it produces. Just as a tree, thanks to the running water that feeds its roots, does not feel the drought, so that which applies to the meditation of the law of God, even when temptation comes to test him, strong in the help of God, far from losing, he obtains eternal salvation, according to these words of the Apostle: "It is by many tribulations that we must enter in the kingdom of God." (Acts 14:21) "And all he does will prosper." These words are clear, that he who remains faithful to the law of God, and who puts his delights to fulfill his commandments, will see success crowning all his actions; so that all that Joseph did was prosperous, as a reward for his having preferred the fear of God to life itself; it is not so, no, it is not so with the wicked. (Ps 1:4) This repetition means that the fate which he predicts to the ungodly will be invariable; they have no happiness to expect for the future, and will only receive misfortunes until death. This is why the Psalmist adds: "They will be like the dust that the wind scatters from the face of the earth." (Ibid. 4) Thus the wicked will perish like the dust that the wind carries off from above the face of the earth, to annihilate it: in fact, the dust carried off from the earth, which was its support, disperses through the air and annihilates itself insensibly, thus the impious rejected by the angels before the face of God, their Creator, the only principle of life, perished forever. "And the wicked will not be raised in the day of judgment." (Ibid. 5) These words are worthy of attention. Judgment, they who did not want to be given any work of God which they could account for the law of God was for them an object of contempt and denial, they cannot therefore before the court of God render any according to the law given to them, so convinced of arrogance and revolt against God, they will rise only to see the truth of what they did not want to believe, and to perish forever, because they dared to accuse God of falsehood. "Neither the sinners in the assembly of the righteous." The Psalmist represents here

three kinds of men, the ungodly, the sinners, and the just, in the order followed by the error. As for the ungodly, they are quite foreign to the righteous, because as we said, they did not want to live under the law of God. The wretches who live under the law of God will be cited before the tribunal of Jesus Christ, and separated from the righteous to give account of the commandments of the law which they have received, and that they did not put into practice to obtain the approval of God and to avoid his reproaches. For the righteous who have applied themselves with holy activity to the fulfillment of the law, they will obtain the reward. "For God knows the paths of the righteous. (Ibid. 6) In the language of Scripture, God knows those who remember his precepts, and engage in the practice of good works to obtain the crown he reserves for the righteous. As for those who have made a game of forgetting God and neglecting the salvation of their soul, he will say to them: "Depart, I do not know you, workers of iniquity." (Luke 13:27) "And the way of the wicked will perish." This psalm ends as it began, and it teaches us that the wicked whose actions it has made known, have to wait for an eternal loss. As I have pointed out, it is said of God that he knows the paths of the righteous, because they walk in his law, and that the way of the wicked shall perish because it is outside the law of God; for, says Solomon, all the ways of the ungodly are covered with darkness (Prov. 4:19), while the way of the righteous shines with a glowing light, under the guidance of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT
<b>(Psalm 31:9)</b>  <b>QUESTION 38.</b> IF THE HORSE AND THE MULE HAVE NO INTELLIGENCE, HOW MUCH LESS THE EARTH, WHICH HAS NO FEELING? WHY IS THE EARTH INVITED TO BLESS THE LORD? — These words should not be heard in the sense that comes first. It is the work here that utterly proclaims the glory of the Creator, because it	<b>(Psalm 31:9)</b>  <b>QUESTION 16.</b> MAY THE EARTH BLESS THE LORD, THAT IS TO SAY, LET IT PRAISE AND CELEBRATE ITS POWER; HOW THEN DO YOU EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF THE PSALMIST: WILL THE DUST PRAISE YOU, WILL IT ANNOUNCE YOUR TRUTH? — These words should not be heard in the sense that comes first. It is the work

excites all those who see it to bless the one who created it, as a perfectly executed vase praises the craftsman Who is the author. We read in the Psalms, "Will the dust praise you, will it proclaim your truth?" (Ps. 29:10) In every living substance, it is not the will that does not exist, it is the work itself which blesses its author. If you prefer to hear these words in a spiritual sense, then the earth can mean man, as the prophet says: "Remember, Lord, that we are only earth," and these are the works of creation which are for him an exhortation to celebrate the glory of the Creator. "May the earth bless the Lord," that is, praise and confess your truth. How then do we read in another psalm: "Will the earth praise you, will it announce your truth?" These words, therefore, must not be understood in the sense which they seem to present at first; for the earth has no feeling and cannot give thanks to its Creator. But if you hear them in a spiritual sense, the earth here can mean man, according to this word of the prophet: "Remember, Lord, that we are earth." The prophet therefore exhorts the works of creation to burst into praise in honor of the Creator, and so he attributes the confession of truth to creatures who, however dumb they are, seem to proclaim glory of the one of which they are the work. This is why the Psalmist gives the earth a voice to bless God among the works of creation.

here that utterly proclaims the glory of the Creator, because it excites all those who see it to bless the one who created it, as a perfectly executed vase praises the craftsman Who is the author. We read in the Psalms, "Will the dust praise you, will it proclaim your truth?" (Ps. 29:10) In every living substance, it is not the will that does not exist, it is the work itself which blesses its author. If you prefer to hear these words in a spiritual sense, then the earth can mean man, as the prophet says: "Remember, Lord, that we are only earth," and these are the works of creation which are for him an exhortation to celebrate the glory of the Creator. "May the earth bless the Lord," that is, praise and confess your truth. How then do we read in another psalm: "Will the earth praise you, will it announce your truth?" These words, therefore, must not be understood in the sense which they seem to present at first; for the earth has no feeling and cannot give thanks to its Creator. But if you hear them in a spiritual sense, the earth here can mean man, according to this word of the prophet: "Remember, Lord, that we are earth." The prophet therefore exhorts the works of creation to burst into praise in honor of the Creator, and so he attributes the confession of truth to creatures who, however dumb they are, seem to proclaim glory of the one of which they are the work. This is why the Psalmist gives the earth a

	voice to bless God among the works of creation.
--	---

**(Psalm 19:4; 40)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 17.** “HE HAS PLACED,” SAYS THE PSALMIST, “HIS TENT IN THE SUN,” THAT IS TO SAY, HIS BODY IN WHICH JESUS CHRIST DWELT, AND WHICH WAS DELIVERED BY PILATE TO THE TORTURE OF BURNING; HOW THEN IS IT SAID IN ANOTHER PSALM WHICH HAS THE OBJECT OF CHRIST: “THE FLOGGING SHALL NOT COME NEAR TO YOUR TABERNACLE,” (Ps. 40) SINCE INDEED HE DECLARED THAT HIS BODY WAS A TEMPLE. — The body of the son of man and the Son of God is indeed a temple. Yet God, that is, the Son of God, though he came in visible flesh, fixed his dwelling in the soul. The soul as well as the body are therefore the tabernacle of the Son of God, although there is only one God and man, the Son of God and the son of man. The blaze, therefore, has not approached his tent in the sense that his soul, where his divinity lives, has been freed from the torments of hell or the princes of hell. The torture of the cross and the sufferings of the flesh, to which he had been condemned as guilty, though he was innocent, made him fear that his soul might feel some pain in the underworld; The Scripture, therefore, shows that the trouble was not able to approach his soul in the underworld, because he descended to it, that is to say, he allowed his sufferings only to confound the darkness, and to convince madness of the princes of darkness. That's why the Lord says, "My soul is sad unto death." (Matt. 26, Mark 14) The Savior abandons his soul to the sadness that was in his nature, but it immediately wins the victory and robs those who had upset her to the point of death, followed by an eternal joy, and this text of the whole man can still be heard, because he who has not known sin was not subject to torture. prescribed by law.

## (Psalm 23)

### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 111. ON PSALM 23.** — The title of this psalm indicates the subject. Before speaking of the mysteries of Our Lord Jesus Christ, he designates the day of the Lord: "To this David for the first day of the week." Saying, "To this David," he has in sight the one of whom this David was the figure and of whom the prophet said, "And my son David will lead them." (Ezek. 37:24) The first day of the Sabbath is the first day of the week. Indeed, the first day following the Sabbath is the Lord's day, as testified by the Evangelist: "On the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to the sepulcher, etc." (Matt. 28:1) Now, this day of the Lord is the symbol of the mystery of the Savior, but to expose this psalm following the logical order, the Psalmist begins with the person of God the Father, so that the mystery of the divinity may be manifested to men of God. He who wishes to treat any subject must take it in his principle, in his origin, on pain of being unable either to make known his nature or to persuade of its truth. The Prophet begins with these words: "The earth and all that it contains is to the Lord." (Ps. 23:1) These words, "The earth and all that it contains is to the Lord," are a profession of faith. Here he follows the authority of the ancient saints who taught that the earth and all that it contained was to the Lord. He adds: "The globe of the earth and all who live in it are his." He feared that he had not explained his word enough, saying, "The earth and all that it contains is to the Lord," he makes it clearer by saying: "The globe of the earth and all those who live are his." He teaches us that all the earth without exception is to the Lord, with all that it contains, and that there is absolutely nothing that does not belong to him. There are heretics who support the contrary and who, according to the apostle St. Peter, deny the sovereign domain of God (2 Pet. 2:10), but they are condemned by the testimonies of the prophets who testify that everything belongs to God. He founded it on the sea. (Psalm 23:2) This is what he explains in another psalm where he says: "It is you who have made the earth on the water." (Ps.135:6) To give support to the faith, he shows how it was done. In the midst of the confusion of all things, while neither the earth nor the heavens had a definite form, the earth, by the order of God, the earth became compact and was over water, so that the earth and the water had a peculiar property, and conformed to their origin. This is why God says

in the book of Kings: "Is it not I who made the waters?" "And he established it above the rivers." (Ps. 23:2) It is established above the rivers in that it contains the waters which are enclosed within it and which, circulating through a thousand secret channels, give it the necessary density so that excessive drought does not remove its consistency and make it unfit for cultivation. These waters provide a vivifying sap to the roots of trees and plants and at the same time freshness in dry places. The Psalmist then shows the little usefulness of faith without a holy life: "Who will go up on the mountain of the Lord, or who will stop in his holy place?" (Ibid. 3) He now exposes what must be the one who recognizes a creator God; he has forewarned the punishment of those who deny the empire of God over all that exists, he wants to learn now from those who confess this authority that they cannot avoid themselves to be punished if their life is not in accordance with their faith. This mountain of the Lord is heaven, which he says in another psalm: "I raised my eyes to the mountains from which help is to come." (Ps. 120:1) The place of the Lord is the place where he manifests himself. It was said to Joshua when the Lord appeared to him, "The place where you are is a holy place." (Josh. 5:16) Jacob said of where he saw God: "This is the house of God." (Gen. 28:17) "He whose hands are innocent and the heart pure." (Ps. 23:4) This is he whom he declares worthy to ascend on the mountain of the Lord, that is to say in heaven, or to stop in his holy place, the one whose works are innocent and the pure heart in the cause of God, that is, in faith. It can rise in the sky and stop in its holy bond. Indeed, as soon as he has left this life, he will ascend into heaven. And when the city of Jerusalem comes down from heaven for the coming of the Lord, he will be worthy to stop because of his innocence in the place where the Lord must judge the living and the dead; while the wicked and the sinners will be unworthy to stop in the holy place where God pronounces his judgments, because the ungodly ones will rise again for their loss and the sinners for an eternal punishment. If the sons of Israel, because of their sins, could not bear the brightness of Moses' face when he came down from the mountain (Exod. 29:29), how much more will a conscience charged with crimes fear? to raise your eyes to the Lord of glory seated on the throne of his majesty, especially when he hears him say to them: "I do not know you, the workman of iniquity. Who has not received his soul in vain." (Ps. 23:4) He now indicates the different kinds of sins from which one must be exempt. First, he is innocent and has a pure heart that has not prostituted his soul to idolatry; for it is

vanity par excellence, and he who submits to it renders his soul a slave to corruption. "And who has not made a deceitful oath to his neighbor." He has contented himself with indicating two essential duties, one with regard to God, the other to the neighbor, because he who is faithful to these two commandments will also fulfill all the others, to the testimony of the Lord Himself: He tells us to "love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your strength. This is the first commandment; and the second is like it: You will love your neighbor as yourself. These two commandments contain all the law and the prophets." (Matt. 22:37) But who can love God with all his heart and not keep his law? Who can have charity for his neighbor and indulge in sin, since the fear of God is for him the principle of love of neighbor? "This is the one who will receive from heaven the blessing and will obtain mercy from God his Savior." (Ps. 23:5) Here is the reward of one who, faithful to his duties towards God and man, his Creator and neighbor will have practiced faith and charity, he will receive from the Lord a blessing that will cover him with glory, and he will obtain mercy for those whom he has not been able to fulfill. No one can take vigilance so far that he absolutely avoids all sin, but if he has been attentive and faithful to perform the essential duties, he will obtain from God mercy for less important things. The Psalmist gives God the name of Savior because he does not want the death of the one who is going to die, but rather that he is converted and lives. (Ezek. 18:32) "This is the generation of those who seek it, of those who seek the face of the God of Jacob." (Ps. 23:6) It is one and the same generation who seeks, according to the Psalmist, the Lord, and who seeks the face of the God of Jacob. This is not without purpose, for although these two things are good, there are here two very distinct degrees. It is good to seek God, but it is perfect to seek the face of the God of Jacob. Indeed, the most worthy are those who stand before the judge's face. Such, then, is the generation of these merits and of this reward; it is the innocence and the purity of the heart which bring to this bliss, as it is injustice and iniquity, that lead to perdition. There are indeed two generations, the generation of iniquity, which is the mother of Cain, and the generation of justice, which is the mother of Abel; one has faith and pure life, the other infidelity and vice. These are the two laws of good and evil, of God and of the devil, and one becomes the son of him whose law one follows. Thus, the generation of those who seek the Lord is faith in God and love of neighbor, as we have said. He who believes in God always seeks his protection, and no one is unjust

to men when one wishes to render himself favorable God. This is what the Psalmist seems to indicate when he says, "The God of Jacob, because God is known in Judea." (Ps. 75:2) But why does he say that they seek his face when God himself says to Moses: "You will not be able to see my face?" (Exod. 33:20) If Moses sought, but in vain, to see the face of the Lord, their search is useless, since they are no better than Moses. We answer that no one seeks to see God unnecessarily, because the Psalmist says here that they seek the face of God to make us understand that they are worthy to see the one they seek. We know well who we look for when we see his face; but as the face of God cannot be seen by mortal eyes, the 'Psalmist' designates this divine face under these expressions: The God of Jacob. "*Diapsalma.*" (Ps. 23:7, Septuagint) This word *diapsalma*, "pause," indicates in this place a change of person. After what relates to the person of God the Father, the Psalmist places the mystery of the Son of God in order that the order that exists between the Father and the Son be perfectly observed. The law was given by Moses to be like a teacher who was to instruct men and prepare them for the school of righteousness to make himself worthy to wait for the year of the Lord and the day of reward, that is, to say that those who had faithfully preserved the hope of the coming of Christ would receive it and thus escape safely in the aftermath of Adam's sin, because the advent of the one they hoped for should give them the mercy that erases the sins where they let themselves be carried away. This is what the Psalmist has said above: "He will receive," he says, "the mercy of God his Savior. Raise your doors, O princes," he exclaims. (*Ibid.* 7) It is the voice of the holy angels of which it is said in the Gospel that they approached the Savior and served him. (Matt. 4:11) Therefore they turn to the princes and powers against whom the Apostle tells us that we have to fight (Eph. 6:12), and tell them to raise the gates of their prince, that is to say, of the devil, who is the chief of the erring princes, and by whom one descends into hell. These gates are the infidelity and deceptive seductions of idolatry. "And you, eternal doors, rise up." These eternal gates are faith, hope, and charity, because one cannot destroy preaching that is based on truth. These doors, on the contrary, which are, as I have said, unbelief and the ploys of idolatry are only for a time, because every lie is essentially transient. As soon as the truth is revealed, it will give him the death blow. The Psalmist therefore asks them to lift the doors of their prince from darkness, that is to say, to remove the error of the plurality of the gods and to substitute faith in one God by Jesus Christ.

The Apostle declares that this is the object of his mission, to announce not only to men but to princes and heavenly powers the mystery of one God in Jesus Christ. (Eph. 3:9) "And the King of glory will come in." (Ps. 23:7) He asks that these deceptive doors of the devil, product of the lie and presumption that inspired him to be equal to God, be raised to let in the King of glory, who is Our Lord Jesus Christ. Indeed, faith in God cannot enter a soul until it has rejected from it the error produced by the evasiveness of the devil. These princes of whom we have spoken cannot receive Christ as king, who preaches to them the faith in one God, before having rejected from them the traditions of error and lies opposed to the unity of God, no only those which have sprung up on earth, but the one which is the author of Satan, the chief of these princes; for they sought to spread on earth the error they had concentrated in heaven under the inspiration of the devil, that is to say, to proclaim themselves gods by a lie which is the image of the devil. "Who is this king of glory?" (Ibid. 8) One could have regarded as a vain title that name of King of glory given to Jesus Christ; the Psalmist therefore supposes a person who asks him this question: "Who is this King of glory?" It seems that he is in astonishment and wants to learn if it is true, if it is worthy to call Jesus Christ the King of glory. He is answered, "The Lord is strong and mighty, he is the mighty Lord in battle," to teach him that it is not in words alone, but in the testimony of the works that Jesus Christ is the King of glory. It is indeed the strength and power that made him win an entire victory over the devil and his followers, and which showed him the true king of glory. The Psalmist repeats again: "Princes, raise up your doors, and you, eternal doors, rise up," (Ibid. 9) that is to say since the proofs of the power of Christ, which you can not contradict without crime, teach you that he is worthy of being called the King of glory, reject the error of your minds. He adds, "And the King of glory will come in," to teach them that they cannot participate in the faith of Jesus Christ until they have cleansed their hearts from all the defilements of idolatry. The Holy Spirit cannot enter a man unless he is completely renewed. "Who is this king of glory?" (Ibid. 10) This repetition is intended to confirm the truth. All new teaching cannot be well understood unless it is repeated, and what we hear for the first time excites astonishment and surprise. "The Lord of the powers is himself this king of glory." By this repetition the Psalmist teaches us that the Lord of powers is rightly called the King of glory, for what is more just than to give the title of King of glory to the one who rules over the powers? This is what

made the Apostle say: "If they had known him, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory." (1 Cor. 11:8)

### (Psalm 35:7)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT

**QUESTION 7.** WHY IS IT SAID IN THE PSALMS, "YOU WILL SAVE MEN AND ANIMALS," AND IN THE PROPHET JONAH, "I WILL NOT SPARE A CITY WHERE A HUNDRED AND THIRTY THOUSAND MEN AND A MULTITUDE DWELL. OF ANIMALS? "(JON. 4:11) WHILE THE APOSTLE SAYS, "DOES GOD CARE FOR OXEN? "(1 COR. 9:9) — To consider only the words, there is, it seems contradiction, but if we examine the condition of man and animals, this contradiction disappears. God takes care of all creatures, because it is from him that all hold their existence; but he does not keep the animals for themselves. He keeps animals for men and not men for animals. Thus he who cares for men preserves animals, but without them being the object of that particular care which he reserves for men. For what hope can there be in animals?

### (Psalm 39; 50)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 12.** WHY IN THE LAW IS AARON HIMSELF COMMANDED TO OFFER BURNT OFFERINGS FOR HIS SINS, WHILE DAVID SAYS, "YOU DID NOT ASK FOR A BURNT OFFERING FOR SIN," (PS. 39) AND IN ANOTHER PSALM: "THE BURNT OFFERINGS ARE NOT PLEASING TO YOU." (PS. 50) WHY DOES HE COMMAND TO OFFER THEM TO THEM, IF THEY ARE NOT PLEASING TO HIM? — It is evident that God cannot indulge in the holocausts that are offered to him; but that the groans and the pain of the heart may satisfy for sin and obtain forgiveness. But God wanted the sacrament to be the testimony of sin, and by the removal of the sacrifice the sinner confessed publicly his sin. He tells us in another place how the forgiveness of sins is obtained:

"Share," he tells us, "by his prophet, your bread with the hungry; when you see a naked man, cover him, and do not despise those who have the same origin with you." (Isa. 58) Or again: "God despises not a heart broken by pain and humiliation." (Ps. 50) God therefore commands us first to confess our sin, and then teaches us the means to obtain our forgiveness. Nowhere does he command to offer a sacrifice for a known sin; it is always for the sins of ignorance, for man sins even without knowing it, and his intention is faulty even when he believes he is acting according to the rules of justice. It is these sins that God declares to be obliterated by sacrificial oblation.

### (Psalm 39:16)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT

**QUESTION 6. WHY DOES DAVID SAY IN ONE OF HIS PSALMS, "LET THESE BE CONFOUNDED AND ASHAMED, SAYING TO ME, 'VERY GOOD, VERY GOOD,'" WHILE THE SAVIOR SAYS, "ALL RIGHT." GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT, ETC. WHAT DAVID REGARDS AS AN INSULT, OUR LORD APPLIES TO HIM WHOM HIS MERITS HAVE MADE WORTHY OF REWARD.** — This question has a lot of analogy with the previous one. A single expression may have different meanings, as I have recalled above<sup>1</sup>. David's enemies, who were seeking his ruin, rejoiced at his troubles. Thus they approved of the sufferings and persecutions which David had to endure of Saul and his son Absalom, and said loudly that there was nothing better. It is absolutely as if someone who receives an outrage is said to have done well, because it is to rejoice in the harm done to him, and to say, nothing more just, he deserved it. The Savior uses the same expression in the joy of the good works of Him whose merit He proclaims: "All right, good and faithful servant." He testifies to his joy that the servant has gone from more and more worthy, by saying to him, "Very well, you have done well to increase the sum of your merits so that one and the same expression is employed in two very different circumstances." This is what we ordinarily say of a man: he is judged, it is what precedes or what follows which determines the meaning which must be given to these words. They are taken

sometimes in good, sometimes in bad part, just as concupiscence is sometimes heard in a good sense, sometimes in a bad sense.

1 In the second part of the New Testament questions, question 54.

### (Psalm 50)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 112. ON PSALM FIFTY.** — This psalm is here placed not in chronological order, but for a particular reason. The title, in fact, is determined by this reason and not by the rank of this psalm. To consult only history, it is prior to the third, because David was taken from his crime by the prophet Nathan before the rebellion of his son Absalom, who wanted to take away both his kingdom and life. The reason why this psalm is placed fiftieth, comes from the law which prescribed that the number fifty was a remission number. This number is the one that comes first after seven weeks and is the figure of the day of the Lord. In the same way, after seven days the first day is the one that was made in the beginning, is always the first to succeed the past week, so the fiftieth day that comes after seven weeks is the first in a mysterious sense, and it is called twice the day of the Lord, first of all because it was made in the beginning by the Lord, and when returning to himself it is always the first after the periodic revolution of each week; and second, because it is on this day that the Lord has risen after triumphing over death; and for this reason it is also called the day of the Lord. It is therefore rightly that forgiveness is attached to the number fifty that we notice to be the first in a mysterious sense. The law was also given on the fiftieth day. On the forty-eighth day after leaving Egypt, the children of Israel are ordered to purify themselves for two days to prepare themselves to receive the law on the third day. (Exod. 19:10) What does this purification mean, if not the remission that is made on the fiftieth day that they receive the law after being purified? All their past sins were obliterated, and now they had to account for their actions according to the law they were given. It was for the same reason, that the law had established, that purchased possessions returned to their first owners in the fiftieth year. (Lev. 25:10) This is why this psalm is placed on the fiftieth, for David implores the forgiveness of his

sins in the sense that we have said: "Have mercy on me, O God! according to your great mercy." (Ps. 50:1) David knows the seriousness of his crime and he asks for forgiveness in these terms: "Have mercy on me, O God! according to your great mercy," because the greatness of mercy breaks out especially in the forgiveness of great faults. "And erase my iniquity according to the multitude of your kindnesses." To make him understand the enormity of his sin, he calls it an iniquity, because iniquity is not a slight sin, and he who erases iniquity, that is to say, that is to say, who does not impute it has possessed in itself an abundant source of mercy. He therefore has no excuse, and thereby not only softens the soul of his judge, but inspires him with feelings of compassion. Pity naturally enters the soul when a guilty man is seen to make a sincere confession of his sins, and to express a deep pain. He who has no regret for his faults seems to mock his judge, and he implores his forgiveness only to escape punishment and fall back into the same faults. "Lift me more and more of my iniquity, and purify me of my sin." (Ibid. 4) He has just proclaimed the great mercy of God, so he asks him to purify him completely and not to leave in him the least stain, the least stain of injustice that may offend his regards. And as a reason for his prayer, he adds, "Because I know my iniquity, and I have my sin before my eyes." (Ibid. 5) As he knows the extent of his he fears that he will not be entirely forgiven for him. Consideration of the greatness of his sins throws him into anxiety, because he knows that enormous sins are not easily forgiven. He confesses his sin with tears; he always has it in front of his eyes to completely bend his judge and make him favorable. He knows that it is written, "First confess your iniquities to be fair to them." (Isa. 43:26) "I have sinned before you alone, and I have done evil in your presence." (Ps. 50:6) Here he considers the remedy of his error from another point of view, and brings a new reason for his prayer, which, in the first place, justifies him because another than God, is the enemy of the Creator God, since in his place he establishes another to whom he attributes his authority, so David declares that he is not guilty of this iniquity by saying, "I have sinned before you alone, and I have done evil in your presence," that is to say, as it is in your presence that I have sinned, and not to another whom I should have recognized as God by mistake, my fault is less great than the sin of those who have devoted themselves to certain ruin.. I am not impious, but sinful, because I have sinned not against you, but in your law, I have not denied you, but it is in recognizing that you are my God and my Lord that I

have sinned against a man. Therefore, since I am not guilty of the crime that offends you personally, forgive me for the sin I committed against one of my kind, for in preaching I have not denied the honor due to your name for the transport to another. It was therefore a motive to touch the heart of his judge. Since God exhorts to convert the great number of those who sin against him, he must kindly welcome those who have not sinned directly against him and who implore their forgiveness on other grounds. Indeed, the Lord's will is that his servants always have recourse to his protection. "So that you will be recognized as righteous in your words, and you will remain victorious when judging your conduct." By imploring the mercy of God, he begs him not to change the decrees of his justice which is not equal to the innocent and the sinners, that is to say, who gives to each according to his works; but the holy prophet does not ignore the nature of the mysterious prayer he addresses to God. He knows that God often repeats in the law: "I am merciful, I, the Lord your God;" (Exod. 22:27) He therefore prayed that this faith dwell in divine mercy, and God is justly acknowledged in his words, faithful to what he has promised and not allowing his mercy to be chained by the sins of men. Sinners also know the promises God has made to the faithful observers of the law, and as they persevere in their sins, they accuse God of falsehood. Their guilty life prevents them from believing in the truth of God's promises. King David therefore asks God to overcome this prejudice and to fulfill his promises, to cover with confusion those who, without observing his commandments, accuse him of not giving what he has promised. "For here I have been formed in iniquity." (Ps. 50:7) Here he recalls the cause of the infidelity of the human race, the inclination of man to sin to soften the judge's severity towards him. He wants to speak here of the original fault of which Adam is guilty, and whose responsibility has extended to all mankind. In conceiving iniquity to the deceitful persuasion of the enemy, he has subjected all his posterity to the slavery of sin, and none of his descendants can escape this slavery. That is why David adds, "And my mother conceived me in sin," that is to say, the sin of which Adam is the source, extends to all those who are conceived and born to life, and become for them an obstacle to the practice of good. David therefore hopes that God will show mercy to him because he has a fierce enemy against him that brings him to evil. By his sin the first man was enslaved to the devil, who received the power to act upon his body and to seduce him with malicious finesse the misleading attractions of sin which make him fall into the

trap and rob him of life. It is to the memory of this slavery that the doctor of the nations exclaims: "I feel in my members another law which fights against the law of my mind," (Rom. 7:23) so that at this sight, God, sensitive to his complaints, extends his hand to him in the midst of the difficulties which besiege him. "Because you loved the truth." (Ps. 50:8) Since you have loved the truth, he said to God, come to my aid, I beg you, for you know that I have explained to you the true weaknesses of my soul, and you have resolved in your mercy to save the sinner by healing by a heavenly providence the wounds that sin has made to him on the earth. That's why he adds, "You have revealed to me the secrets and mysteries of your heart." These secrets and these mysteries are the help that God has prepared for the human race, of which the Apostle said: "What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him," (1 Cor. 2:9) Who are those who love God? those who accept his law without trying to disguise or excuse their faults. These secrets of the heart are thus revealed to those who love God. The multitude of sins with which they deplore the sad influence could have made them question the justice of punishment, reject their faults on their origin, and make God their creator responsible for their sins. Their hearts were enlightened with a spiritual light and they discovered the providence of God in the coming of Christ who was to come to destroy the sin that had exercised the tyranny on mankind since the evasiveness of Adam. King David therefore asks God that, since he has resolved to save the human race one day from the sad state in which he sees him reduced, he anticipates for himself, the victim of the same misfortune, the salvation he must give to all one day, and that he should give to his prayers and tears the free gift which he held in reserve and which he could not grant before the marked time. How will it be done? He indicates it with the following words: "You will water me with the hyssop and I will be purified." (Ps. 50:9) He rightly asks to be purified by sprinkling with the hyssop. The children of Israel sprinkled the poles of their house with this sprinkling to escape the exterminating angel (Exod. 20:22), and David also asks to be purified of his sins by the sprinkling of the hyssop, also to escape from death. "You will wash me and I will become whiter than the snow." Now it is evident that God's action is at a great distance from the action of man, which is why David says, "And I will be whiter than snow," because the work of God has a character of perfection which the work of man cannot have. It therefore requires to be purified by sprinkling with

hyssop, that is, just as the body is purified by water from its material soils, so the hyssop is the purified figure of a spiritual operation of the souls by the defilements of sin. Sprinkling with the hyssop is a kind of purification whose visible action indicates the inner and invisible purification. "You will make me hear words of comfort and joy." (Ps. 50:10) There is no doubt that the voice of one who announces the remission of sins does not spread joy in the souls of sinners. Who would not rejoice, indeed, at the news of the forgiveness granted to him? For the forgiveness of God gives all security for the present and for the future. So David adds, "And the humbled bones shall tremble with gladness." David's humiliation was of two kinds, he was humbled in his sin, for sin is no one's cause of elevation, and he humbled himself to implore his forgiveness, and begged God under the ashes and the sackcloth to show mercy to him, and the pardon bestowed upon him, brought joy to his soul and strength to his dejected body. "Turn aside your eyes from my crimes, and give me all my iniquities." (Ibid. 11) David asks God to forgive him as he should later grant by faith in Jesus Christ, and that the Savior who He has been spiritually promised by him to forgive sins with truly repentant hearts. The one in whom one no longer looks at sins and whose iniquities are erased has no longer to fear being treated as guilty, and his enemies are reduced to silence. He who does not look at sins does not impute them either; to look away from the faults of a sinner is to refuse to receive an accusation against him. But how is David, accused only of two crimes, accusing himself of many other iniquities? Since Nathan had assured him that God had forgiven him, why does he beg forgiveness with so much solicitude? He did not plead only his cause, but in this confession of his sin he understood all the spiritual miseries of his people. He therefore asks for a complete renewal, for he who gets his pardon is not without confusion if he is not restored to his first state and in a rank which excludes all shame, and he announces for all the others the grace of God who was to purify all their sins. "Create in me, O God, a pure heart, and reestablish a righteous spirit in the depths of my womb." (Ibid. 12) This is to implore the mercy of God in excellent dispositions. David does not confine himself to asking for the forgiveness of the past, his solicitude extends to the future, he is resolved to hate sin to no longer fall back, and he prays to God to fortify him with the spirit of justice that he will re-establish in his soul, that is to say, give him a new spirit which keeps him from all sin and all that is contrary to his well-known will. Now, one has a pure heart when

one keeps oneself away from all internal and external sin, from action and thought. It is almost impossible to observe this purity of heart in all its extent, but at least it must be in the essential relationship of the soul with God and keep his pure heart in the mystery of God and Jesus Christ by inviolably preserving the faith we have in them. Indeed, we read in another place of Scripture, "Who can be glorified to have a pure heart or to be free from sin?" (Prov. 20:9) But David kept his heart pure in his dealings with God, because he never claimed the help of vanity, that is to say idolatry, and that he never did what the Lord had commanded him. He adds for the future: "Do not reject me from your face, and do not remove from me your Holy Spirit." (Ps. 50:13) He again expresses the thought that we have indicated above, he is sure of his forgiveness, but he is concerned with the entire reform of his soul. The servant to whom we are content to forgive remains far from the presence of his mistress. There is no rage against him, yet his crime is not effaced in the mind of his master or judge. David therefore prayed that his sin be entirely obliterated and that he be made worthy to approach the face of the Lord and to prophesy as in the past, which was granted him. This is what he asks with these words: "And do not remove from me your Holy Spirit," that is, the spirit of prophecy. "Give me the joy of your salvation, and support me with the sovereign Spirit." (Ibid. 14) He asks God for the joy that was promised in the coming of Christ, so that, cleansed and purified of all his tasks, he would be filled with the joy that would come from the salvation he had and, far from losing his crown, he was confirmed on the throne by the Holy Spirit. He calls it the Sovereign Spirit because he is above all creatures and it is through him that kings rule. "I will teach your ways to the wicked, and the wicked will be converted to you." (Ibid. 15) He thus expresses himself so that the wicked may learn by his example what is the goodness of God who welcomes sinners as soon as they confess their faults and who does not abandon the impious who have converted to him, but never cease to exhort them by showing mercy to others. "Deliver me, God of my salvation, of all the blood I shed." (Ibid. 16) David shows here that his sin was worthy of death to proclaim the greatness of God's mercy to him and to excite sinners to take refuge, as he did, in the bosom of God's clemency. "And my tongue will celebrate your righteousness with hymns of joy. He declares his joy in the justice of the Lord because he perseveres in him the effect of this promise of God: "I will not take away from them my mercy." (Ps. 88:34) David, full of joy and security on this

point, celebrates the righteousness of his God: "You shall open my lips, and my mouth shall proclaim your praise." (Ps. 50:17) God opens his lips by delivering him from slavery. The mouth of the deliverer is opened, but the mouth of the sinner remains closed, shame and fear condemn him to silence, while the one who has regained his full freedom breaks out his transports and publishes the praises of his judge. Thus the Apostle, free from all servitude, as he testifies, exclaims: "My mouth opens to you, O Corinthians." (2 Cor. 6:11) "If you had desired a sacrifice, I would have offered it to you." (Ps. 50:18) David speaks here of certain knowledge; he remembered what the holy prophet Samuel had said to King Saul, who believed that he could erase his sin not by the pain of his soul or by the shedding of his tears, but by offering a sacrifice. "Does the Lord want sacrifices, and do not ask for obeying his voice?" (1 Sam. 15:22) because these sacrifices can be harmful and do not appease the righteousness of God. The only thing that soothes him is a soul who, at the memory of his sin, weeps in the bitterness and tribulation of the heart the misfortune of offending God. "But with burnt offerings you will not be delighted." (Ps. 50:19) No, God is not pleased with the holocaust, but with the feelings we have just spoken of. It's up to the soul to satisfy him, without looking outside for anything to pay him ransom. That's what can really help him a lot. Just as the soul has yielded to the seductive charms of sin, it must submit to the pain of penance, and then God will take pleasure in erasing his sins. "For the sacrifice worthy of God is a broken spirit of pain. God does not despise a suppressed and humiliated heart." (Ibid. 19) David tells us here what a sacrifice God receives for sins; it is impossible to appease him unless he who has rejoiced at the loss of his soul opens his heart to pain and repentance and thus finds life again. Any turbulent and unrestrained man is often exposed to receiving wounds that cannot be cured without pain; In the same way sinners cannot redeem their sins without the guilty soul being penetrated with a deep sense of pain., for it is to all righteousness that he who has tasted the joy which reason disapproves be subject to the pain which reason commands, "Lord, treat favorably Sion and make them feel the effects of your goodness." (Ibid. 20) Zion is the figure of the Church, and according to our feeling, which will not seem unlikely, David suggests that she ask God to fulfill his promise, because he knows that she will receive the complete remission of her sins when God has fully fulfilled His decrees through Jesus Christ, that is, those who hope in the salvation promised to them will be

delivered from all sin; and indeed they will be delivered by Jesus Christ not only from their own sins, but from the sin of Adam, of which all his descendants are born guilty. "And the walls of Jerusalem will be high." Had they been destroyed? The walls of Jerusalem are here the figure of the Church which was to be raised by the law in Jesus Christ. Its walls are the saints, as we learn from the Apocalypse of St. John, where we see that we must understand by the city of Jerusalem and by its walls the servants of God. (Rev. 21:12) King David knew that it was Christ who was to fulfill the promise of the deliverance of the servants of God; he therefore asks God to fulfill it, that is to say, the Church rises on the foundation of faith, and those who hope for their salvation by this faith are delivered from the slavery of sin. "Then you will agree to a sacrifice of righteousness, oblations and burnt offerings." (Ps. 50:21) David declares here that God would be blessed with oblations and burnt offerings when the Church was built, and not sacrifices offered without rule or at the pleasure of everyone, but: "You will agree to the sacrifice of justice." Sacrifice is right when you take from God a worthy victim of his; but there is no sacrifice neither more just, nor more worthy than the offering we make to God of ourselves. "God is spirit." (Jn. 4:24), so we must offer him spiritual sacrifices, that is, to offer the living God a living victim. David had declared that God was not in favor of the expiation of sins, the carnal sacrifices; He teaches, therefore, that spiritual sacrifices should be offered to him, and that he would be agreeable to them, because these sacrifices are worthy of God; that is to say, sacrifices were of little value in the past, because they were all exterior, and they are now of great value, because they are spiritual. "Then will we put calves on your altar to offer them to you?" He has just announced that the ancient sacrifices would succeed spiritual sacrifices; what do these words mean: "Then will we put calves on your altar to offer them to you?" That is to say, these material victims are the figure of the spiritual victims, since he has declared that God has no carnal sacraments for pleasing. These calves are here as a figure of the new people to whom faith in Jesus Christ gave a new birth and whose piety is sacrificed every day on the altar of the Lord. Since David has spoken clearly about the Church here, the sacrifices that are placed therein are necessarily spiritual sacrifices.

**(Psalm 77:25)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 20. WHY DOES SCRIPTURE SAY, "MAN HAS EATEN THE BREAD OF ANGELS," SINCE ANGELS, CREATURES SIMPLE IN THEIR NATURE AND CLOTHED WITH A VERY SPIRITUAL POWER, DO NOT NEED FOOD? —** This bread, which the Psalmist calls the bread of angels, is nothing but manna. Now, the word manna means: What is this? For the sons of Israel, when they saw on the earth a kind of white seed of coriander, said one to another, What is this? in Hebrew MAN HU. (Exod. 16:15) This bread or food was not created by virtue of the laws that govern the world, by the blending of certain elements, it descended from heaven by an effect of a divine providence. It did not even exist in the upper regions of the air, it was created at the moment by the power of God to nourish the bodies. It was given the name of angels' bread because it was created by that same power that gave the angels existence and life; for no life is apart from God. It is because it descended from heaven that manna was called the bread of angels. The Psalmist has expressed himself in this way to recall the greatness and excellence of the blessings of God upon men, that at this sight they may give thanks to God, who governs his servants with so much kindness, that he gives, if it is necessary to them, the very food of the angels. The Apostle says, among other things, "Christ was the stone," (1 Cor. 10:4), that is, Christ was called the stone, because it is his power that made pouring gushes of water from the stone. (Exod. 17:6) In the same way, as it is by an effect of its power that the manna is descended from heaven, it receives the name of manna, that is, of bread; this symbolic food is the figure of what is now offered in the Church, and men, that is, the Jews, have eaten the bread of the Christian people shown in Scripture by the angels. Let us add that grace is now more abundant than it was under the prophets, as well as the liberty given by Jesus Christ, for where the spirit of the Lord is, is freedom. (2 Cor. 3:17) This is why, considering the times and the bonding of graces, the name of angels was given to the Christians, whose bread, which is Jesus Christ, was eaten by the Jews, who are here called men; for Jesus Christ belongs rather to those to whom he has been revealed and who have the honor of bearing this name. This question can therefore be understood in two different senses, and

the manna may be called or the bread of the angels of heaven, or the bread of the Christians, according to the explanation we have given.

## PROVERBS

**(Proverbs 10:27)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 33.** SOLOMON SAYS THAT THE YEARS OF THE WICKED WILL BE SHORTENED; HOW DO WE SEE IMPIOUS PEOPLE IN GREAT NUMBERS PROLONGING THEIR LIVES ON EARTH? — Justice demanded that all the impious who forget their Creator, to attribute to their creature a sovereign authority, to see their abbreviated days, I would say more, were immediately deprived of life. But Scripture wants to speak here of the ungodly, who, while living under the law of God, were inclined to worship idols. These ungodly are of a worse kind than the others, for while they know God, they despise His authority to obey His servants. Now, the Apostle teaches us that it is good of them when he says: "We know that all that the law says is to those who are under the law. "(Rom. 9:19) As for the Gentiles, they are not numbered among the living.

**(Proverbs 18:17)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 30.** IT IS WRITTEN IN PROVERBS: "THE RIGHTEOUS ACCUSES HIMSELF FIRST FROM THE BEGINNING OF HIS SPEECH. HOW CAN HE BE RIGHT IF HE IS A SINNER? — All truth is at the same time

justice. By confessing what he is, the man is right because he is telling the truth. Sinners, on the contrary, who do honor to their faults, cannot be justified. This man who accuses himself therefore deserves the name of righteous, because in confessing his sin, he asks for its forgiveness and implores the mercy of God, because he knows that it is written in the law: "Confess your sins for to be justified." (Isa. 43:26) But to make this admission at the beginning of one's speech is to do it without being forced to do so. For whoever lives even in the fear of God can be without sin, since he mixes with our thoughts, and we sometimes sin as in spite of ourselves? One can, however, hear these words of the catechumen who embraces faith to be justified. Since he asks to be changed, he certainly confesses his sins to be justified.

### **(Proverbs 22:2)**

#### **1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT**

**QUESTION 32. WE READ IN THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON: "THE RICH AND THE POOR HAVE COME TOGETHER, THE LORD IS THE CREATOR OF BOTH."** HOW THEN CAN ONE SAY THAT THERE IS NOT IN GOD THE ACCEPTATION OF PERSONS? — Far from the spirit of the faithful, such an impious assertion. Scripture, so as not to appear to teach to despise the poor and to honor the rich, reminds us that God is the creator of both, not as rich or poor, but as that they are men. For if their fortune is different, their nature is the same; and if the opportunities which arise in life have the result of giving to some the prosperity which follows the riches, or the hardships which accompany poverty, it is not a reason to despise those whom God has not humiliated, or to honor those to whom the truth has not borne witness. Those who are unquestionably worthy of contempt are the public corrupters of morals and the sacrilegious violators of the law of God, just as we must honor those who love God and keep his law faithfully. The truly rich men in the eyes of God are those whose lives are pure, and the more they look despicable in the world, the more they are worthy of honor in heaven. Those whom the favors of the present life have made possessors of immense wealth, if they know each other well and understand the will of God who gave the earth to all men, which raises his sun for all and spreads indiscriminately on all the

dew of heaven (Matt 5:45), seeing that the injustice of the times, or an unforeseen misfortune, or the indigence deny some what God has given to all, will tell them of what they possess, and thus fulfilling the will of God, they will be rich not only on earth, but in heaven, and these transient riches will not exclude them from the possession of eternal riches. As for those whom poverty seems worthy of contempt, if they meditate on the future judgment of God, they will see that they will be eternally rich, where the rich of the age will be reduced to extreme indigence, and will repent of having not been poor on earth.

## ECCLESIASTES

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT <b>(Ecclesiastes 9:4)</b>	2ND CATEGORY OT <b>(Ecclesiastes 9:4)</b>
<b>QUESTION 39.</b> WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF SOLOMON MEAN: "HOPE IS IN DARKNESS; A LIVING DOG IS BETTER THAN A DEAD LION?" — Darkness is the figure of propriety and ignorance. The sacred writer therefore wishes to make us understand that there is more hope in the people of propriety than in an apostate; This is indicated by the following words: "A living dog is better than a dead lion," because the lion is the strongest of all animals, and the Christian religion is stronger than all other sects. If, therefore, we separate ourselves from this divine	<b>QUESTION 19.</b> IT IS WRITTEN IN ONE OF SOLOMON'S BOOKS: "HOPE IS IN DARKNESS, AND A LIVING DOG IS BETTER THAN A DEAD LION." — Darkness is here the figure of ignorance and propriety, because a pagan offers more hope than an apostate. The dead lion is the apostate Christian; as long as he kept the faith, he was a lion; does he come to lose faith? He is a dead lion. The dog is the gentleman whom we can hope to embrace the faith, and we have this hope as long as he is alive. For the other, on the contrary, no more hope. Our Lord teaches us that the dog is the

<p>religion, we lose the hope of salvation, and we become worse than a pagan, because it is possible for a pagan to embrace the faith and to acquire the rights to salvation which the lost apostate. If the pagan remains in his unbelief, the apostate is in a worse state, because it is much worse to have lost salvation than to have never have it. Our Lord Himself teaches us that the dog is the figure of the Gentiles when he says, "It is not good to take the children's bread and give it to the dogs. (Matt 15:26)</p>	<p>figure of the Gentiles when he says, "It is not good to take the children's bread and give it to the dogs." (Matt 15:26)</p>
---	---

### (Ecclesiastes 7:17)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 15.** SINCE THE LAW PRAISES THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE TRUE RIGHTEOUS IS THE ONE WHO DOES ALL RIGHTEOUSNESS, HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF SOLOMON: "DO NOT BE OVERLY RIGHTEOUS?" — Over-righteousness is exposed to sin, while moderate justice makes men perfect. He who is too just is not exempt from sin; for if you want to take every fault in detail, it is for you as many occasions of sin. Let us add that the justice of God is always moderate. Sometimes he forgives sinners, sometimes he is angry with them; sometimes he does not punish them as much as they deserve; he supports them to bring them back to good. The law by itself cannot relax from its severity; it is therefore up to us to soften it in the interest of those who are subject to it. The man who models his conduct with that of God cannot be just too much.

**(Ecclesiastes 13:16; Psalm 142:2)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 22.** WHY DOES SOLOMON SAY, "JUSTIFY YOUR SOUL BEFORE YOUR DEATH," AS WE READ IN A PSALM, "NO LIVING MAN WILL BE JUSTIFIED IN YOUR PRESENCE?" —Justifying one's soul before one's death is to embrace faith in the hope of the future life so as not to die in sin. Now Solomon makes this recommendation to him who lives under the law and does not practice justice. If this man comes to repent and walk in the ways of righteousness, he justifies his soul before his death. Solomon gives him this counsel for the coming judgment, lest by his negligence he should die in his sin. David, on the other hand, speaks of the perfection of justice, that is, no one will be justified in the presence of God, and will not be judged worthy of promises unless he dies in righteousness. As long as he lives on this earth, he does not yet fully deserve the goods of the future life. This is why the Savior said, "He who perseveres unto the end will be saved." (Matt. 10:22; 24:23)

WISDOM

**(Wisdom 1:13; Ecclesiastes 11:14)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 34.** HOW DOES THE SAME SOLOMON SAYS ON ONE SIDE: "GOD DID NOT KILL," AND IN ANOTHER: "THE GOODS AND THE EVILS, THE LIFE AND THE DEATH, THE POVERTY AND THE LUXURY COME FROM GOD?" — Nobody doubts that all good things come from God; as for the

evils of doubt it is here a question, they are only such as when they serve to chastise us. This is how God speaks to the fishermen by his prophet: "I will hurt you," that is, I will penalize you. Now, life and death are represented to us as coming from God, because he has given the law that promises life to those who observe it, and threatens those who transgress it from death, which is called the second death. As it is God who gives back to everyone what he deserves, it is from him that come the sentence of life or the condemnation to death. God is not the author of death, but the judge; the author of death is sin. How, then, could God have made death, who knows no sin? It is because it gives to sins what is due to them, that Scripture says that death comes from him, although it does not come in reality, but from him who has sinned; it is in the same sense that poverty and wealth come from God, there are some who, under the impression of the fear of God, despise the pleasures of the senses, flee the lavishness of life, do not turn away the eyes of the poor and the needy, and thus accumulate real treasures, because it is written in Proverbs: "The love of the rule makes misery and genealogy disappear. (Prov. 13:18) But those who have no fear of God, who live without rule and without restraint, and despise the poor, will be in want, as it is written: "They have been full," not only of negligence and improvidence for their interests, but of contempt for the law which was given to them. It is in this sense that God made the poor and the rich; as the transgression of the law produces poverty, we attribute this effect to God, the author of the law, and when others, for fear of His judgments, are faithful to the prescriptions of the law, we also say that it is God, author of the law, who enriches them.

### (Wisdom 11:17)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 20.** WE READ IN THE BOOK OF WISDOM: "GOD CREATED THE WORLD OF INVISIBLE MATTER," AND THESE VERY CONTRARY WORDS THAT WE WERE CREATED FROM NOTHING. — Sacred Scripture clearly teaches us that God simultaneously created all the elements of the world in a chaotic and confused state, in which the darkness was mingled. These confused elements, air, fire, water, earth, darkness, are what Scripture calls an invisible

matter, as we read in Genesis; "The earth was invisible and unformed." (Gen. 1) So it is from these confused elements that God created the world by establishing the faith, so that the waters coming together, the earth could offer the human race. This distinction and this separation of elements is a dwelling place for man under the spherical space which covers the earth.

## ISAIAH

(Isaiah 4:1)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 47. BY WHAT MEANS DO THESE WORDS OF ISAIAH: "SEVEN WOMEN WILL TAKE, ETC.," SHOULD THEY BE UNDERSTOOD AS THE SEVEN CATHOLIC CHURCHES? —** "In that day," said. the Prophet, "seven women will approach a single man and say to him: We will eat our bread, we will provide ourselves with our clothes; that your name alone be invoked against us, deliver us from the reproach upon us." It is a generally accepted truth that these seven women are the seven churches (Rev. 2-3); for although the Church is one, or represents it as having seven different forms, just as one body is composed of seven different members. Indeed, we are not the only members of the Church of which Jesus Christ is the head (Eph. 5:23); the inhabitants of heaven are part of it. Let us therefore speak of only one church, whether we represent seven different churches, there is no contradiction. The Church is one because she has only one leader who is Jesus Christ; and we can say that there are seven churches,

because just as the members are different, so the spiritual powers among which we take our place, are different virtues which are called for that the powers of the airs. Now, they are different so that they do not all have the same power, but that they all contribute to forming the body of Jesus Christ; for he is the head of the body of the Church, and it is to him that the whole body owes its existence, that is to say, it is from him that everything, whether in heaven, or on the earth, originates. Now, speaking of the Church of the earth, the sacred writer mentions all the churches, because the mysteries of the Creator, which are taught in the Church of the earth, are at the same time announced to the heavenly spirits. When the inferiors are educated, those who are above must necessarily participate in this teaching. This is what makes the Apostle say: "I, the youngest among the saints, have received the grace of announcing to the Gentiles the incomprehensible riches of Jesus Christ, and of enlightening all men on the economy of the mystery which had been hidden for centuries in God, the creator of all things, so that the principalities and the celestial powers knew by the Church the wisdom of God, so different in its operations." (Eph. 3:8-10) So it is the Church of the earth who instructed the heavenly powers, because the truth has come out of the bosom of the earth. It is therefore to mention the heavenly powers that the seven Churches are here named as forming only one people, and the prophet represents them addressing their supplications to the Savior made man. They understood that Jesus Christ was born to erase the contempt first of those who lived under the law, and then of all other peoples. They recollected this prophecy: "There shall come from Zion a Redeemer who will deliver Jacob and remove from him all ungodliness." (Isa. 59:20) These seven churches then approached one man, that is, from Jesus Christ at his birth, and said to him, "We will eat our bread, we will provide ourselves for our clothes; that your name alone be invoked against us, deliver us from the reproach upon us." What is the object of their prayer? If they eat their bread, if they provide for their clothes, that is to say, if they have food and clothing, what are they lacking? The bread is the emblem of life, and the garment signifies the action of putting on God, because the one who is without God is in a real state of nakedness. That is why the Apostle says: "All of you who you have been baptized into Jesus Christ, you have been clothed in Jesus Christ." (Gal. 3:27) And in another place: "If, however, we are found dressed and not naked." (2 Cor. 5:3) But what is this contempt that these women ask to be delivered? These seven churches represent the people who lived

under the law in expectation of the promised Christ who was to erase their sins. They say to him, "We will eat our bread," that is to say, the words of the law which teach the existence of one God shall be our food; because man does not live only with bread, but with every word that comes out of the mouth of God." (Deut. 8:3; Matt. 4:4) "And we will wear our clothes," that is to say, we will bear the name of our Creator, for each one is as clothed in the profession of his faith. It is to their clothes that the representatives and the magistrates are known. But it was not enough to be worthy of God; he has therefore established that it is through the knowledge of one God that man would become heir to the kingdom of heaven. The law purges him of his sins, delivers him from the second death which, according to the sentence pronounced against Adam, kept the men in the underworld, and thus free of all ties he goes to the paradise of God the Father, where the Lord promised at the right time that he would be with him. (Luke 23:43) Although the people of whom we have just spoken, and whose seven churches are the figure under the law of God, he was guilty of both his own sins and the sin of his first father; "For," says St. Paul, "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God." (Rom. 3:23) These churches therefore ask God to deliver them from their reproach by the invocation of the name of Jesus Christ, because those who bear the sign by which he has conquered the dead, cannot be held under the power of his enemy. And it is not only these churches of the earth, but the spiritual powers who dwell in heaven, who ask that the name of Jesus Christ be invoked upon them. For all spiritual and celestial they are, these powers do not fail to be subject to contempt if they remain distant from their Creator, and failing to know their leader they go astray and cannot be members of his body. The prophet himself confirms the truth of the explanation we have just given, adding, "In that day the Lord will shine on the earth the light of His counsels," (Isa. 4:2, according to the LXX) and a little further on: "The Lord will wash the filth of the sons and daughters of Zion, and cleanse them of the blood that is in their midst." Is it not evident that in this day that is to say, on this day when the promises of God will be fulfilled, and the mysteries of faith revealed to men, those who were subject to the death sentence have been enlightened, purified by the knowledge of their Creator, and became heirs of eternal life! The prophet, therefore, spoke generally here to signify that all needed the grace of God, and to establish that all just or sinners had to wait for His mercy: sinners, to be cleansed of their personal sins and delivered from death; the

righteous, to be free from the sin of their first father, and from the sentence pronounced against Adam, who held all men under the bondage of death, and to recover freedom and their rights to the kingdom of God, from which they are no longer servants but children.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT
<p><b>(Isaiah 9:8)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 37. WHY DID THE DEATH SENT AGAINST JACOB FALL ON ISRAEL, SINCE JACOB IS ALSO CALLED BY THE NAME OF ISRAEL?</b> — The prophet here uses two names designating the same people to mark the distinction of merits by the naming of names. For he who received the name of Israel was called Jacob first. In struggling against the Savior, he understood that it was God whom he saw in human form (Gen. 32:28), and it was after this vision that he was called the man who sees God. The people to whom the prophet gives the name of Jacob here represent the carnal people, like the names that parents give to their children. But the name of the Israelites was never given to this people, that is, to the Jews, whom their criminal conduct made unworthy, because they sacrificed to animals and forests during the reign and rule of King Jeroboam. The people, on the contrary, who offered to Jerusalem, in the temple of the Lord, victims by the ministry of the priests, was called Israel. The kingdom of Samaria was</p>	<p><b>(Isaiah 9:8)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 13. WHY DID THE DEATH SENT AGAINST JACOB FALL ON ISRAEL, SINCE JACOB IS NONE OTHER THAN ISRAEL?</b> — The prophet here uses two names designating the same people. He who was first called Jacob then received the name of Israel after his struggle with the Son of God, and when seeing him in his spirit he was like a man who saw God. The people to whom he gives the name of Jacob here designate the people who do not see God, the carnal people, because of their evil deeds. Just as the patriarch Jacob, before seeing the Christ God, was not called Israel, this people who bears the name of Jacob designate those who do not see God. Israel, on the contrary, represents the part of the people which his holy works have made worthy of seeing God. Now the people of Jacob, who, given over to the worship of idols, leaned on an arm of flesh instead of putting their confidence in the help of God, was delivered to death when God had to march against him the king of the Assyrians. For the words of the prophet must be understood by the</p>

therefore delivered to captivity and death as a punishment for his ungodliness; Jerusalem was protected for some time, thanks to the piety and zeal of its kings for the worship of the true God. But as soon as Jerusalem followed the impiety of Samaria, she was enveloped in her condemnation. That is why the prophet begins by saying, "God sent death against Jacob," that is, against the people of Samaria, whose life was carnal, as we have seen above, and "Death fell upon Israel," that is, upon the people of Jerusalem, because they followed the people of Samaria in the ways of idolatry and were taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar, as the people of Samaria had been led away by Salmanasar, king of the Assyrians. In clearer terms, the sentence pronounced against the wicked extended to the good, because they had ceased to walk in the ways of justice. Indeed, the death sent against Jacob fell on Israel, as we have shown, but without failing to strike Samaria. The cause that sent her against Samaria came to Jerusalem, and was sent there to punish the same crimes as in Samaria. For divine vengeance pursues crime without distinction of persons.

people of Samaria, who first wronged God by establishing calves for whom he sacrificed by the ministry of the new priests whom Jeroboam had instituted. Death was sent against this people; for he was first captured and brought into captivity by Salmanasar king of the Assyrians, to serve as an example to the people of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, the two and a half tribes who remained, and who, under Rehoboam, son of Solomon, offered sacrifices in the temple by the ministry of the priests of the Lord. The prophet calls them the people of Israel because of the tribe of Judah and Levi, whom the people of Samaria should have frightened and brought to goodness, and who also gave themselves up to the evil and the shameful worship of the idols of the people. Yet there were some kings in Jerusalem who, despite the guilty examples given by Solomon and his son Rehoboam, followed David's footsteps and walked in the right way in the presence of the Lord. All the kings of Samaria, on the contrary, proved evil in the eyes of God until the time of their captivity. From there the carnal name that was given to them. Jerusalem having imitated their ungodliness, her people were themselves taken into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon; so these words are explained: "Death was sent against Jacob, and it fell on Israel." It was sent first against Samaria, but the cause that sent it happened in Jerusalem, so he was sent

	there to chastise the same crimes as in Samaria; for the vengeance of God is not attached to the place, but to the crime it seeks to punish.
--	--

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT
(Isaiah 54:1)	(Isaiah 54:1)

**QUESTION 40. WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF THE PROPHET MEAN: "REJOICE, STERILE WHO DOES NOT GET PREGNANT, SING HYMNS OF PRAISE, SHOUT FOR JOY, YOU WHO HAD NO CHILDREN, THE ABANDONED WIFE HAS BECOME MORE FERTILE THAN THE ONE WHO HAS A HUSBAND." —** The children of the earthly Jerusalem who have apostatized the worship of God cannot be invited by the prophet to rejoice, but rather to groan and cry. It is therefore in comparison with the reproach of this Jerusalem that the prophet invites to joy the heavenly Jerusalem which the Apostle calls our mother (Gal. 4:20), because without groans and pain she has more children than the one that causes tears in the children of the flesh, that is to say, the Jews. The heavenly Jerusalem generates spiritual children by faith. The prophet calls her an abandoned wife because she is the life

**QUESTION 15. WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF THE PROPHET MEAN: "REJOICE, STERILE WHO DOES NOT GET PREGNANT, SING HYMNS OF PRAISE, SHOUT FOR JOY, YOU WHO HAD NO CHILDREN, THE ABANDONED WIFE HAS BECOME MORE FERTILE THAN THE ONE WHO HAS A HUSBAND." —** It must be understood here that there are two mothers, one celestial, the other terrestrial, that is to say the free Jerusalem. It is therefore in comparison with the shame of this Jerusalem that the prophet invites to rejoice in the heavenly Jerusalem which the Apostle calls our mother. (Gal. 4:25) The prophet announcing the coming of the Lord and proclaiming with triumphant voice the time when grace is to be poured out abundantly, exhorts to rejoice the heavenly Jerusalem which he says he was abandoned, because it was not

that Adam first abandoned to follow the path of death. When men are regenerated, they return to the life they had abandoned. This life is Jesus Christ who said of himself, "I am life." (Jn. 14:16) God the Father is also life, as our Lord teaches in another place: "For as the Father has life in himself; so has he given to the Son to have life in himself." (Jn. 5:26) There is no doubt that the Holy Spirit is also life, according to this testimony of the Savior: He will receive from what is mine. (Jn. 16:15) He who receives from life is himself life. The three persons are therefore one life, it is by faith in this life that we are regenerated, it is our mother, as we read in Genesis, because this life is the mother of all the living. (Gen. 3:20) Now, who are these living except those who believe?

around her children begotten by faith. The time had come when she must have the children who were predicted of her, and in far greater numbers than the children of the earthly Jerusalem, for the number of Christians far surpassed that of the Jews. She is also called sterile because she is a virgin and she begets her children spiritually by faith and without the flesh having any part in it. Also the prophet does not say that she gives birth, because the birth is always accompanied by their gift. She, on the contrary, utters cries of joy when she sees the salvation of the human race. The earthly Jerusalem has a husband, because it breeds children according to the flesh. The city is here assimilated to a mother, just as the heavenly habitation destined for us is called our mother.

## MATTHEW

(**Matthew 1:1**)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 3. WHY DOES ST. MATTHEW, WRITING THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST, BEGIN LIKE THIS: "THE BOOK OF THE GENERATION OF JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF DAVID," SINCE ABRAHAM IS BEFORE DAVID? —** St. Matthew begins thus, because he wanted to place at the head of the genealogy of the Savior the promise of his incarnation, according to these words of the Apostle: "Whose fathers are the patriarchs, and from whom came out according to the flesh Jesus Christ." (Rom. 9) He says, "The book of generation," because the incarnation of Christ is the result of many different people from the same stock; the ancestors of Christ followed various ways, and the Savior desired that all should concur in forming the body of which he was clothed. There are among them Jews and Gentiles, righteous men and sinners; Ruth was Moabite, and Bersabee of adultery became a lawful wife. The Savior borrows the flesh of all to bring them all back to unity. St. Matthew says, "Of Jesus Christ, the son of David," though Abraham is before David, because Jesus Christ is called especially David's son because of his kingship, that is to say, as God comes from God, and that as king he descends from a king according to the flesh, for it was said to David, "I will place on your throne a son that will be born of you." (Ps. 131)

(**Matthew 1**)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 4. WHY DOES THE APOSTLE ST. MATTHEW DIVIDE ALL GENERATIONS INTO THREE SETS? —** This division is based on the difference of things and times. So the first set goes from Abraham to David, because it includes a first order of things, Abraham being the father of faith as David is the father of kingship; for Saul he made himself unworthy of the throne, which he lost

through his fault. Another order of things begins from David to transmigration, where the disapproved Jews of God were removed from the royal authority. After the transmigration of Babylon to Jesus Christ, opens a third period of calamities and miseries, captivity and dispersion of the Jewish people; for although after the transmigration of Babylon and the seventy years passed, the Jews were sent back to their homeland by Cyrus, they never again had a fixed state of rest. Judea had no more kings, and the Jews never ceased to live a restless and wandering life. At the very time of Christ's coming, they recognize that they are in captivity. "We do not have, they say, any other king than Caesar." (Jn. 19) This is the reason why St. Matthew established three sets of generations, to show the various states and changes deserved of the Jewish people from the promise to the advent of Jesus Christ, but times did not fail to converge to the end to the same grace.

### (Matthew 1)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 5. WHY DID THE EVANGELIST SAY THERE ARE ONLY FORTY-ONE GENERATIONS WHEN THERE ARE FORTY-TWO, BECAUSE THREE TIMES FOURTEEN ARE FORTY-TWO? —** Numerically one counts only forty-one generations; logically, we find forty-two. Jeconiah, who was born in transmigration and to whom we give the title of king, as we read in the book of Chronicles, finishes the second part; and as after the transmigration king Nebuchadnezzar allowed him to remain in his kingdom, he also begins the third series which continues until Jesus Christ. Jeconiah is counted twice, that is to say that he finishes the second part and begins the third. Indeed, the Evangelist continues: "And after the transmigration of Babylon, Jeconiah begot Salathiel." Until this Salathiel, the kings of Judah of the family from which Joseph was born were seated on the throne, and Jeconiah had a first son named Assur, but since Joseph was born from Salathiel, the Evangelist passes Assur in silence, and puts Salathiel immediately after Jeconiah his father, to descend to Joseph, husband of the virgin Mary, after Josiah comes Jeconiah. Though it is by Joachim, father of Jeconiah, that we reach Joseph, the Evangelist passes over Joachim in silence, and

immediately puts Jeconiah not to exceed the number of fourteen generations, and after Jeconiah, Saluthiel and his son, from which Joseph descends.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(Matthew 1:16; Luke. 3:23)	(Matthew 1:16; Luke. 3:23)
<p><b>QUESTION 56.</b> WHY DID ST. MATTHEW WRITE THAT JACOB WAS JOSEPH'S FATHER, WHILE ST. LUKE GIVES HIM AS THE SON OF HELI, SO THAT HE IS NOT WISELY PRESENTED AS HAVING TWO FATHERS, OR DO NOT KNOW EXACTLY WHO HIS REAL FATHER IS? — There is no doubt that Jacob was Joseph's father. In fact, the genealogy starts from David, descends by Solomon and reaches in a straight line until Jacob, of which Joseph is the son. The genealogy of Heli, on the contrary, the son of Mathat, is true of David, but descends by Nathan, also son of David, until the time of the advent of the Savior. Now, the two evangelists, following the genealogy of each of the two brothers, made a split, that is to say that St. Matthew descends from David by Solomon to Joseph; while St. Luke ascends from Eli, contemporary with the Savior, by the line of Mathat, son of Nathan, son of David, and he unites the tribes of Eli and Joseph, to show that they are of the same family. By associating Heli with Joseph, he shows that their genealogy is no different, but that they are brothers, and that consequently the</p>	<p><b>QUESTION 6.</b> WHY DOES ST. MATTHEW GIVE JOSEPH JACOB AS FATHER, WHILE ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE IT WOULD BE HELI, SO MUCH SO THAT JOSEPH IS REPRESENTED TO US WITH RATHER LITTLE SKILL AS HAVING TWO FATHERS OR A MAN WHOSE TRUE FATHER WE DO NOT KNOW? — There is no doubt that Jacob was Joseph's father. In fact, the genealogy starts from David, descends by Solomon and reaches in a straight line until Jacob, of which Joseph is the son. The genealogy of Heli, on the contrary, the son of Mathat, is true of David, but descends by Nathan, also son of David, until the time of the advent of the Savior. Now, the two evangelists, following the genealogy of each of the two brothers, made a split, that is to say that St. Matthew descends from David by Solomon to Joseph; while St. Luke ascends from Eli, contemporary with the Savior, by the line of Mathat, son of Nathan, son of David, and he unites the tribes of Eli and Joseph, to show that they are of the same family. By associating Heli with Joseph, he shows that their genealogy is no</p>

<p>Savior is not only Joseph's son, but also Eli's son. For the same reason, in fact, that the Savior is called the son of Joseph, he is also the son of Heli and all the others who are of the same tribe, a truth which the Apostle expresses in these terms: fathers the patriarchs, and from whom came out according to the flesh, Jesus Christ. (Rom. 9:5) It is by a divine inspiration that St. Luke ascends from Heli by the line of Nathan to David, and by Tharam his father, to Sem, son of Noah, and before the flood, to Seth, son of Adam, given to him to replace Abel, and he presents the Savior as sons of Adam for the same reason that he calls him sons of Joseph and Eli. He raises him even above Adam, and before the existence of all flesh, he declares that Christ is the son of God. There are some who think that Heli had married Jacob's wife, following the law's prescription that if a man died childless, his brother or one of his relatives would marry his wife and give children to his brother. (Deut. 25:5) It is then understood, say they, that Joseph was begotten for his brother Jacob, whose wife he had married. The two genealogies are thus united, and it is not extraordinary that the evangelist gives Heli as his father to Joseph. This explanation has no probability and does not solve the difficulty. On the contrary, the sentiment which we have expounded above unites the two brothers of one father, and shows that Christ was the Son of God before any generation.</p>	<p>different, but that they are brothers, and that consequently the Savior is not only Joseph's son, but also Eli's son. For the same reason, in fact, that the Savior is called the son of Joseph, he is also the son of Heli and all the others who are of the same tribe, a truth which the Apostle expresses in these terms: fathers the patriarchs, and from whom came out according to the flesh, Jesus Christ. (Rom. 9:5) It is by a divine inspiration that St. Luke ascends from Heli by the line of Nathan to David, and by Tharam his father, to Sem, son of Noah, and before the flood, to Seth, son of Adam, given to him to replace Abel, and he presents the Savior as sons of Adam for the same reason that he calls him sons of Joseph and Eli. He raises him even above Adam, and before the existence of all flesh, he declares that Christ is the son of God. There are some who think that Heli had married Jacob's wife, following the law's prescription that if a man died childless, his brother or one of his relatives would marry his wife and give children to his brother. (Deut. 25:5) It is then understood, say they, that Joseph was begotten for his brother Jacob, whose wife he had married. The two genealogies are thus united, and it is not extraordinary that the evangelist gives Heli as his father to Joseph. This explanation has no probability and does not solve the difficulty. On the contrary, the sentiment which we have expounded above unites the two brothers of one</p>
--	---

How, indeed, does St. Luke express himself? "And Jesus, beginning his mission, was about thirty years old, as it was believed of Joseph, who was of Heli," that is, that it was believed that Jesus was the son of Joseph, and was not only Joseph's son, but also Eli's son. (Luke 3:23) He does not say that Joseph was son of Eli, but just as Jesus was called Joseph's son, he was also sons of Eli, because Joseph and Heli were sons of two brothers, that is, of Solomon and Nathan, sons of David, and thus going up by David unto Abraham, and Noah, and Seth, even unto Adam himself, and over Adam, he taught that the Christ was the Son of God. Indeed, saying: "Who was son of Seth, who was the son of Adam, who was the son of God, he shows that Christ was the son of Adam in the same way that he was called the son of Joseph, that Mary said, "and my son, why did ye do this, and behold, we, your father and I, were greatly afflicted." (Luke 2:48) But he rises above Adam for to unite Christ to God the Father, in order to make it clear that if he were called the son of all who descend from Adam to Joseph and Heli, he had before all these generations the true Son of God, and thus to confuse the error of Photius, who maintained that Christ came only from Mary and had not existed before him, so that he was given for fathers those of whom he was not the son, and denied that he was the God's true son, when he really was, if we adopt the

father, and shows that Christ was the Son of God before any generation. How, indeed, does St. Luke express himself? "And Jesus, beginning his mission, was about thirty years old, as it was believed of Joseph, who was of Heli," that is, that it was believed that Jesus was the son of Joseph, and was not only Joseph's son, but also Eli's son. (Luke 3:23) He does not say that Joseph was son of Eli, but just as Jesus was called Joseph's son, he was also sons of Eli, because Joseph and Heli were sons of two brothers, that is, of Solomon and Nathan, sons of David, and thus going up by David unto Abraham, and Noah, and Seth, even unto Adam himself, and over Adam, he taught that the Christ was the Son of God. Indeed, saying: "Who was son of Seth, who was the son of Adam, who was the son of God, he shows that Christ was the son of Adam in the same way that he was called the son of Joseph, that Mary said, "and my son, why did ye do this, and behold, we, your father and I, were greatly afflicted." (Luke 2:48) But he rises above Adam for to unite Christ to God the Father, in order to make it clear that if he were called the son of all who descend from Adam to Joseph and Heli, he had before all these generations the true Son of God, and thus to confuse the error of Photius, who maintained that Christ came only from Mary and had not existed before him, so that he was given for fathers those of whom he was not the son, and

explanation as improbable as useless as we have reported above, and according to he is called the son of Heli, the story of the evangelist simply means that Christ was the son of Adam, but not that he was the son of God. In going up, indeed, from the sons to the fathers, he arrives at Enoch, whose father is Seth, the father of Seth is Adam, and Adam has for father God; but I do not see that he was otherwise useful to express oneself in this way. If, on the contrary, each of those who form the continuation of the genealogy are called the fathers of Jesus Christ, in the same sense that he was called the son of Joseph, following these words: "Whose fathers are the patriarchs, and of whom went out according to the flesh Jesus Christ;" (Rom. 9:5) Following this order, we understand that the Evangelist says that he was son of Seth and son of Adam. And going back above all the patriarchs, he declares that he was the Son of God to show that he existed long before those of whom he is called the Son.

denied that he was the God's true son, when he really was, if we adopt the explanation as improbable as useless as we have reported above, and according to he is called the son of Heli, the story of the evangelist simply means that Christ was the son of Adam, but not that he was the son of God. In going up, indeed, from the sons to the fathers, he arrives at Enoch, whose father is Seth, the father of Seth is Adam, and Adam has for father God; but I do not see that he was otherwise useful to express oneself in this way. If, on the contrary, each of those who form the continuation of the genealogy are called the fathers of Jesus Christ, in the same sense that he was called the son of Joseph, following these words: "Whose fathers are the patriarchs, and of whom went out according to the flesh Jesus Christ;" (Rom. 9:5) Following this order, we understand that the Evangelist says that he was son of Seth and son of Adam. And going back above all the patriarchs, he declares that he was the Son of God to show that he existed long before those of whom he is called the Son.

**(Matthew 1:17)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 85.** IT IS CERTAIN THAT FROM DAVID UNTIL THE TRANSMIGRATION OF BABYLON, THERE ARE SEVENTEEN GENERATIONS; WHY, THEN, DOES THE EVANGELIST COUNT FOURTEEN, PUTTING OCHOSIAS WHO AFTER JEHORAM IS THE SON OF JEHOSHAPHAT, AS WELL AS JOASH OF OCHOSIAS AND AMASIAS SON OF JOASH? — It must be admitted that the evangelist has conformed here to the spirit of the law. It is therefore rightly that these kings have been cut off from the series of generations; for their impiety has been perpetuated without the slightest interruption. After beginning in Joram, he continued on to Osias, son of Amasias, and none of these princes could find in the virtues of their father a support which enabled them to appear in the series of kings of Judah. Jehoram gave himself up to all kinds of crimes, but Jehoshaphat had to be kept among the kings. Uzziah owed the same favor to Joatham's wife. The life of these three princes was only continual impiety against God. It was thanks to his father's merit that Solomon remained on the throne, and his son Rehoboam had to be preserved in spite of his criminal life among the kings of Judah. As for these three impious kings, they have been shut up in the midst of their crimes and cut off from genealogy; for the example of vice entails the ruin of a whole race when it is given with brilliancy and without discontinuity. To be more precise, these kings have been omitted, because Joseph does not descend from their race. The Evangelist, indeed, has followed from Abraham the genealogy of those of whom Joseph descends, to whom Mary was born, from whom was born the Christ.

**(Matthew 1:18)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 52.** IF CHRIST WAS BORN OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, THAT IS TO SAY IF IT WAS BY HIS OPERATION THAT HE WAS MADE FLESH OF THE FLESH OF MARY, WHY IS IT WRITTEN: "WISDOM, WHICH IS CHRIST,

BUILT A HOME?" (PROV. 9:1) — This question can be heard from a double point of view. First, the house of Jesus Christ is the Church, which was built by his blood. His body may also be called his house, just as it is called his temple. If it is called its temple because it is inhabited, it can also very well be called its home, as we read in the law. But if the body was formed by the operation of the Holy Spirit and we thought we could give it the name of house, we will ask why we attribute this formation to the person of Jesus Christ. The Son's operation is the Father's operation, because they have one and the same virtue. In the same way the operation of the Holy Spirit is the operation of the Son of God, because of the unity of nature and will. Whether the action comes from the Father, or from the Son, or from the Holy Spirit, it is the Trinity who acts, and all that is done by the three divine persons is the work of one God. The Son's operation is the Father's operation, because the Father and the Son have one and the same virtue. In the same way, the operation of the Holy Spirit is the operation of Christ, because the Holy Spirit has received from what was his. If we consider the action of persons, it is by the operation of the Holy Spirit that Christ was made flesh, that is, made man; but if we consider the action of the divine nature, it is Christ who has worked in the virgin to become flesh; for the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ have one and the same divinity, and therefore the work of the Holy Spirit is the work of Jesus Christ.

(Matthew 1:25; Luke 2:6-7)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 53. IF GOD DOES ALL RIGHTLY, WHY IS IT SAID THAT THE SAVIOR WAS BORN THE EIGHTH OF THE CALENDAR OF JANUARY? —** Nobody will push extravagance to deny that God is inspired in everything he does by a sovereign right. So Jesus Christ, descending from heaven to save the world and wanting to show that he was the Creator of the world and the times, wanted to be born as a man to grow in God the human race, so diminished, so diminished, when the light, which is none other than the day, begins to grow after the shortest days. He wanted the time of his birth to be in keeping with his divine doctrine, which drew men from the shadow of death to increase their life.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT (Matthew 2:2)	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT (Matthew 2:2)
<p><b>QUESTION 63.</b> HOW COULD THE MAGI OF CHALDEA LEARN THE BIRTH OF CHRIST, KING OF THE JEWS, ON THE APPEARANCE OF A STAR THAT IS MORE COMMONLY THE SIGN THAT ANNOUNCES A KING OF THE EARTH? — These Magi of Chaldea studied the course of the stars not for any evil, but out of curiosity. As the Evangelist's account suggests, they followed the Balaam tradition that Balak had brought to curse the people of God and that a divine impulse forced him to bless him. (Num. 21:20) They knew by this historical fact that the providence of God was to bring out a king of Jacob; Balaam had indeed clearly predicted that a star would rise from Jacob. The Magi, faithful to this tradition, seeing a star shine in the sky outside the ordinary course of the stars, understood that it was the one that Balaam had foretold as the future sign of the birth of the king of the Jews. This fact goes directly against the enemies of religion. Here religion receives a testimony from those who are in the habit of attacking it, for astrologers are enemies of the truth. It is not for an evil reason that the Magi of Chaldea, etc. “A star will come out of Jacob, an offshoot will rise from Israel; he will smite the heads of Moab and ruin all the children of Seth; he will possess Edom, etc.” (Num. 24:17)</p>	<p><b>QUESTION 39.</b> HOW COULD THE MAGI OF CHALDEA LEARN THE BIRTH OF CHRIST, KING OF THE JEWS, ON THE APPEARANCE OF A STAR THAT IS MORE COMMONLY THE SIGN THAT ANNOUNCES A KING OF THE EARTH? — These Magi of Chaldea studied the course of the stars not for any evil, but out of curiosity. As the Evangelist's account suggests, they followed the Balaam tradition that Balak had brought to curse the people of God and that a divine impulse forced him to bless him. (Num. 21:20) They knew by this historical fact that the providence of God was to bring out a king of Jacob; Balaam had indeed clearly predicted that a star would rise from Jacob. The Magi, faithful to this tradition, seeing a star shine in the sky outside the ordinary course of the stars, understood that it was the one that Balaam had foretold as the future sign of the birth of the king of the Jews. This fact goes directly against the enemies of religion. Here religion receives a testimony from those who are in the habit of attacking it, for astrologers are enemies of the truth. It is not for an evil reason that the Magi of Chaldea, etc. “A star will come out of Jacob, an offshoot will rise from Israel; he will smite the heads of Moab and ruin all the children of Seth; he will possess Edom, etc.” (Num. 24:17)</p>

<p>This prophecy comes from Balaam; he was not a prophet, but God chose him to defend the cause of his people and forced him in spite of himself to serve his purposes. Thus we see those whom Saul had sent to seize David, seized with the prophetic spirit, and it is said of Saul himself: "Is Saul also among the prophets?" God wished to show by how great was the majesty of the God of the Jews, who so changed the heart of him who had come to curse, that this false prophet regarded it as a good and commendable action to bless the people of God. God could not fear the curse of him whose heart was in his power. Now, one is allowed to believe that the tradition of this prophet had been preserved by those who applied to the same studies; by carefully examining the stars, they saw an unknown star shining so brightly that it shone out the sunlight (for it was visible during the day), and having conferred between them, they discovered that was the star predicted by Balaam.</p>	<p>This prophecy comes from Balaam; he was not a prophet, but God chose him to defend the cause of his people and forced him in spite of himself to serve his purposes. Thus we see those whom Saul had sent to seize David, seized with the prophetic spirit, and it is said of Saul himself: "Is Saul also among the prophets?" God wished to show by how great was the majesty of the God of the Jews, who so changed the heart of him who had come to curse, that this false prophet regarded it as a good and commendable action to bless the people of God. God could not fear the curse of him whose heart was in his power. Now, one is allowed to believe that the tradition of this prophet had been preserved by those who applied to the same studies; by carefully examining the stars, they saw an unknown star shining so brightly that it shone out the sunlight (for it was visible during the day), and having conferred between them, they discovered that was the star predicted by Balaam.</p>
---	---

(Matthew 2, 14; Mark 6)

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 11. HOW IS IT THAT WE READ ABOVE THAT HEROD WAS DEAD, AND LOWER DOWN, SEVERAL YEARS LATER HE PUT JOHN THE BAPTIST TO DEATH; WHILE IT IS SAID ABOVE THAT JOHN SURVIVED HEROD'S DEATH? —** Herod was king of Judea, and had four sons: Archelaus,

Herod, Philip, and Lysanias. Herod, being dead, was succeeded by his son Archelaus, after whom the kingdom of Herod was divided into four parts. One of these four parts was given to Pilate, who administered him not as king, but as governor, while the sons of Herod retained the title of king. Philippe being dead also, his brother Herod married the wife of Philip, a crime which John the Baptist reproaches him with, which determines this Herod, son of Herod, of whom we spoke earlier to put to death the holy precursor. What does the Evangelist say? "Herod the Tetrarch," that is to say, who governed the fourth part of the kingdom of his father Herod. What doubt is still possible with this addition of Tetrarch, which clearly proves that it is another Herod than the first? It was this same Herod who killed by the sword, James, brother of John, and soon struck by the angel of God, died and devoured by worms.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT  (Matthew 2:18)	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT  (Matthew 2:18)
<p><b>QUESTION 62.</b> WHY DOES IT SAY THAT RACHEL IS MOURNING HER CHILDREN WHEN IT WAS LIA'S CHILDREN WHO HAD BEEN PUT TO DEATH?</p> <p>— According to history, in fact, Rachel's children are of the tribe of Benjamin, in punishment of their personal crimes, that is to say, Sodom's crimes and the abominable crime they committed on the wife of a Levite, they were completely destroyed and destroyed by the other tribes. (Jud. 19) Rachel, therefore, does not wish to receive any consolation, because she knows that there is no hope for those who have perished in this way. The sons of Lia, on the other hand, were put to death in their early years for the cause of the Savior. Also Lia does not</p>	<p><b>QUESTION 12.</b> WHY DO YOU SAY THAT RACHEL CRIES FOR HER CHILDREN WHEN THE CHILDREN OF LIA AND THE TRIBE OF JUDA ARE PUT TO DEATH? — The children of Rachel, as history teaches us, were formerly devastated and destroyed by the other tribes, in punishment for their crimes against nature, and the infamous attack they levied on the wife of a Levite etc.</p>

want to be mourned, because these innocent victims have been sacrificed for God and have certainly received from him for reward the eternal life. For Rachel's sons, they are worthy of tears, because they are forever dead for time and for eternity. The children of Lia shed tears, it is true, but they received spiritual consolations. But the children of Rachel, whose life was carnal, will be consumed in the immaterial flames of hell. But the Evangelist testifies that Rachel mourned the deaths of the children of Lia because she was dying on the fate of her own children seeing the children of her sister massacred for a cause so glorious that their death assured them the inheritance of eternal life. In fact, for the one who is in misfortune, the happiness of others causes them to bitterly deplore their own misfortunes.

**(Matthew 3:14)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 49. WHY WAS THE SAVIOR, WHO WAS A SAINT FROM HIS BIRTH AND WHO RECEIVED THE NAME OF CHRIST THE LORD, BAPTIZED, SINCE BAPTISM WAS INSTITUTED TO PURIFY SIN? —** It is a truth of course that the Savior did not need to be baptized, because he was not made, but was born Christ, as the angel told the shepherds: "Behold, today is to you a Savior, who is the Christ, the Lord." (Luke 2:11) Also John the Baptist, who knew his holiness, refused to give him baptism; but the Savior insisted on receiving him, not to blot out his sins, but to accomplish all justice. It was fitting, in that

person, that he who came to teach men that by baptism they would become children of God, set an example for the future children of God. It was fitting that he who promised that God would give the Holy Spirit to all who would believe, saw the Divine Spirit descending visibly upon him, to give the faithful the sure hope that they would receive the same Spirit, though from an invisible way. Indeed, the Savior who was born of the Holy Spirit, had a pure body of all sin. The divine anointing had been communicated spiritually to his flesh in the womb of the Virgin. The Holy Spirit purified what was taken from the Virgin Mary to form the body of the Savior, and it was the anointing that was given to his body. This is why he received from his birth the name of Christ. What God gave through the ministry of the prophets and the anointing of holy oil to those who received royal consecration, the Holy Spirit gives to Jesus Christ by adding the power to atone for sins. Those who had previously betrayed the name of Christ received exclusively by this anointing the power of command; the Savior received this power in his birth, at the same time that he was born in a state of perfect holiness. What sovereign improvidence, in fact, that the Son of God was born in a body enslaved by sin? Since he came to take charge of the interests of men and teach them to become the children of God through the sacrament of regeneration, he himself had to receive baptism to confirm his doctrine by his example; for a master easily persuades the truth of his teachings when he puts them first into practice. The miracles that accompanied the baptism of the Lord had the effect of manifesting Him as the Son of God, who by the ministry of regeneration came to heal the passions of the body, and to show by His example to those who were to be His brethren, that the sacrament regeneration communicates to him who receives it a divine power.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(Matthew 3:13-17, Mark 1:9-11, Luke 3:21-22, John 1:32-34)	(Matthew 3:13-17, Mark 1:9-11, Luke 3:21-22, John 1:32-34)
<b>QUESTION 50. IF THE SAVIOR WANTED TO BE BAPTIZED TO SERVE AS AN EXAMPLE, WHY, ALTHOUGH HE HAD BEEN</b>	<b>QUESTION 22. IF THE SAVIOR WAS BAPTIZED TO GIVE US AN EXAMPLE, WHY DOES HE FORBID OTHERS TO BE</b>

**CIRCUMCISED, DID HE FORBID OTHERS TO DO SO? —**

Circumcision is a commandment belonging to ancient times. It had to keep its authority until Jesus Christ, and remain in force until the birth of Christ promised to Abraham; Once the promise was fulfilled, circumcision was no longer necessary. It was like Christ's image that Isaac was promised to Abraham. God indeed says to him, "All nations shall be blessed in him that comes out of you," (Gen. 22:18), that is, in Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ came to renew the faith that Abraham had received, so that all nations would be blessed in him who came out of Abraham, that is, in Jesus Christ, according to the promise made to Abraham. Circumcision was therefore the sign of the Son of God promised to Abraham, that is, Christ. This sign of the promise must have ceased at the birth of Christ; but he who was the object of the promise must have received at birth the sign of his father, to be recognized as the one who, according to the promise, was to justify all the nations by faith joined to the circumcision of the heart. The circumcision of the body was the outward sign that distinguished the children of Abraham according to the flesh; the circumcision of the heart is the invisible sign that distinguishes its spiritual children, and that is why carnal circumcision had to cease after the coming of Jesus Christ.

**CIRCUMCISED AS HE WAS? —**

The use of circumcision has been authorized until Jesus Christ; Abraham had received the precept of circumcision as a sign of the promise of Christ, and the precept of circumcision was to be in effect until the birth of the Christ promised to Abraham, and which was to justify all nations by faith, as Abraham himself had been justified. Christ himself must have been subject to the precept of circumcision to make it well established that he was the one who was promised to Abraham; but once the promise was fulfilled, circumcision was no longer necessary. Baptism, on the contrary, has never ceased to be obligatory, because it is to Jesus Christ that this mode of regeneration begins. It was not in use before him, and did not receive its consummation after his advent; but it begins with Jesus Christ and must continue until the end of the world.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(Matthew 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3: 22)	(Matthew 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3: 22)

**QUESTION 54.** IF JESUS CHRIST, OF THE RACE OF DAVID, BECAME THE SON OF GOD ACCORDING TO THE FLESH, THAT IS, IF IN HIS BIRTH HE WAS THE SON OF GOD IN HIS TWO NATURES BECAUSE HE WAS BORN HOLY, HOW CAN HE BE LORD GOD TOLD HIM AFTER HIS BAPTISM: "YOU ARE MY SON, I BEGOT YOU TODAY"? (HEBREWS 5:5; ACTS 13:33; PSALM 2:7) — Christ is the Son of God from all eternity according to the spirit of holiness, but he was born Son of God of the race of David according to the flesh, and on one side as of the other he was not made, he is born Son of God. The words he hears at his baptism are not for him, but to signify the mystery that is fulfilled in baptism. They are addressed to him for all who receive him. They undoubtedly make appear in Jesus Christ made man the power of divinity; but their chief purpose is to confirm this title to those who are baptized, because they then begin to be the sons of God by receiving the Holy Spirit. The body of the Lord was holy in his birth, yet the Christ made man would not have been confirmed in the dignity of Son of God by the sacrament of regeneration if he had not received the Holy Spirit according to the decrees of the

**QUESTION 45.** IF JESUS CHRIST, OF THE RACE OF DAVID, BECAME THE SON OF GOD ACCORDING TO THE FLESH, THAT IS, IF IN HIS BIRTH HE WAS THE SON OF GOD IN HIS TWO NATURES BECAUSE HE WAS BORN HOLY, HOW CAN HE BE LORD GOD TOLD HIM AFTER HIS BAPTISM: "YOU ARE MY SON, I BEGOT YOU TODAY"? (HEBREWS 5:5; ACTS 13:33; PSALM 2:7) — Christ is the Son of God from all eternity according to the spirit of holiness, but he was born Son of God of the race of David according to the flesh, and on one side as of the other he was not made, he is born Son of God. The words he hears at his baptism are not for him, but to signify the mystery that is fulfilled in baptism. They are addressed to him for all who receive him. They undoubtedly make appear in Jesus Christ made man the power of divinity; but their chief purpose is to confirm this title to those who are baptized, because they then begin to be the sons of God by receiving the Holy Spirit. The body of the Lord was holy in his birth, yet the Christ made man would not have been confirmed in the dignity of Son of God by the sacrament of regeneration if he had not received the Holy Spirit according to the decrees of the

goodness of God in the regeneration of man. The Jews were also called sons of God by a feeling of affection, but not by virtue of the sacrament, whose main effect is to give them with the remission of sins, by the Holy Spirit that arises in them, that title children of God. The Savior is therefore born according to the flesh Son of God, and he was confirmed in this title at his baptism. It was impossible that what was born of the Holy Spirit was not born of God, but the Holy Spirit, who descended upon him, far from diminishing the purpose that God proposed in this mystery, gave him a new increase. Christ is the Son of God from all eternity, according to the Spirit, but he is born Son of God of the race of David according to the flesh. It is not by his baptism that he has become, because having been born of the Holy Spirit, his body was pure and holy from birth. At his baptism, he hears these words: "You are my Son, I begot you today," to show that it is baptism that makes men children of God. These words are spoken to him at the moment when the Holy Spirit descends and dwells on him, because they are not children of God until they have received baptism. It is therefore not for him, but for us that he hears these words, to teach us by example how we could become children of God. For it is not for him either, but for us that he was baptized; and just as he says in another place, "It is not for me that this voice has been heard, but for

goodness of God in the regeneration of man. The Jews were also called sons of God by a feeling of affection, but not by virtue of the sacrament, whose main effect is to give them with the remission of sins, by the Holy Spirit that arises in them, that title children of God. The Savior is therefore born according to the flesh Son of God, and he was confirmed in this title at his baptism. It was impossible that what was born of the Holy Spirit was not born of God, but the Holy Spirit, who descended upon him, far from diminishing the purpose that God proposed in this mystery, gave him a new increase. Christ is the Son of God from all eternity, according to the Spirit, but he is born Son of God of the race of David according to the flesh. It is not by his baptism that he has become, because having been born of the Holy Spirit, his body was pure and holy from birth. At his baptism, he hears these words: "You are my Son, I begot you today," to show that it is baptism that makes men children of God. These words are spoken to him at the moment when the Holy Spirit descends and dwells on him, because they are not children of God until they have received baptism. It is therefore not for him, but for us that he hears these words, to teach us by example how we could become children of God. For it is not for him either, but for us that he was baptized; and just as he says in another place, "It is not for me that this voice has been heard, but for

you, so that you may believe. Thus these words were spoken to him in his baptism so that he became our model.

you, so that you may believe. Thus these words were spoken to him in his baptism so that he became our model.

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 7. IT IS CERTAIN THAT THE SAVIOR WAS CALLED FROM HIS BIRTH SON OF GOD AND CHRIST; FOR WHAT THEN DOES THE TEMPTER COME TO HIM AFTER HIS BAPTISM, SAYING TO HIM, "IF YOU ARE THE SON OF GOD, ETC."**— The Savior when born to a virgin was both Christ and the Son of God not by creation, but by virtue of his birth. However, in the first years of his life he annihilated, so to speak, and concealed his power so as not to provoke the impudence of the devil. But when, after his baptism, the Holy Spirit descended on him, and when he appeared to men clothed with the testimony of God the Father, jealousy excited against him that enemy whose event disturbed the plans, for he understood that the institution of baptism was for the salvation of men. He therefore approaches the Savior, the author of this institution, not to approve of it, but to find a way to make him fall into his trap. In fact, temptation is intended sometimes to test, sometimes to overthrow, by cunning, that which it attacks. The demon was anxious to gain from the Savior an answer conforming to his ploys will, which would leave him in full and peaceful possession of all the rights of his empire, because under the guidance of the Savior who would submit to his doctrine, no one could escape from the death which he weighs on all men.

(**Matthew 4, Mark 1, Luke 4**)

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 8. WHY DOES THE SAVIOR RESIST THE TEMPTATIONS OF THE DEVIL ONLY BY SPEAKING TO HIM OF THE WORDS OF THE LAW?**— The Savior not only responds to the devil who tempts him, but to the Jews as instruments of his cruelty against the Savior. He foresaw that the Jews would

render him as an enemy of the law, so he fights by testimonies from the law the impudence of the devil their father, to thus condemn the father in the person of the children and the children in the person of the father.

**(Matthew 4, Mark 1, Luke 4)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 9. WHY DID THE SAVIOR, AFTER HIS BAPTISM, LAST FOR FORTY DAYS AND THEN FEEL THE NEED FOR HUNGER? WHOEVER COULD HAVE FASTED FORTY DAYS COULD NOT FREE HIMSELF FROM THE NECESSITY OF HUNGER!** — It is written, "My son, coming near to the service of God, abide in righteousness and fear, and prepare your soul for temptation." (Eccles. 2:1) The Savior wanted to fast in order to give us the example of applying ourselves to the practice of fasting, if we wish to triumph by the help of God from the attacks of the devil, and to teach ourselves by his example, that we must above all fear his pitfalls, when we embrace the service of God. Unhappy to see that we are moving away from him, the devil redoubles with fury against us. It is therefore in our interest and not for him that the Savior acts here. Likewise, if he agrees to feel the need of hunger, it is not for him, it is for us. Indeed, when he had triumphed by the fast of the temptations of the devil that are not all written, because they did not relate directly to our instruction, after forty days of fasting, he agreed to feel the need of hunger. What was in the nature of man, so that the devil he had conquered, perceiving in him this infirmity of hunger, was excited to tempt him again in the persuasion that he had been vanquished by a man. Such was indeed the mysterious conduct of the Savior, the devil insulted and made his tyrannical empire felt to the man he had conquered, God allowed that he in turn be vanquished by the man who owed to the divine power this victory, and Satan is thus deeply humbled, because he sees only one man and does not understand the power that is in man. He remains astonished and stupefied by this mystery, the knowledge of which escapes him; he has the power of approaching; he has not the power to conquer that which attacks him. Two things were tormenting here, he approached him emboldened by the weakness he saw and he met a virtue he did not suspect, so that in this man he had before him, he suspected the power of God.

Our Lord therefore submits to the necessity of hunger to thwart the wiles of Satan. He no longer prolonged his fast, so to establish the agreement between him, Moses and Elijah.

**(Matthew 3, 11, Mark 1, Luke 7)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 10. HOW IS IT THAT JOHN THE BAPTIST, WHO HAD FIRST BORNE WITNESS TO THE SAVIOR, THEN CONCEIVED OF DOUBTS BY ASKING HIM BY HIS DISCIPLES: ARE YOU THE ONE TO COME, OR SHOULD WE EXPECT ANOTHER? —** Those who think that doubt may have entered the soul of John the Baptist slander the Savior. For they claim that John has reason to doubt, or they accuse Jesus Christ of ignorance, since in their feelings he would have praised a man who thought badly of him. But since it is impossible for the Savior to be mistaken, the praise he gives to John the Baptist is therefore well founded. If they are founded, John has no doubt about Jesus Christ. In fact, in the very time that John of his prison sends his disciples to Jesus to ask him, "Do you read whoever is coming, or should we expect another?" Jesus answers the disciples of his forerunner: "Go and tell John what you have heard and seen: The blind see, the deaf hear, the lepers are healed, the lame walk, the dead rise, and happy is he who is not offended because of me." Now, as John's messengers were leaving, Jesus began to say of John the Baptist to the multitude: What did you go to see in the desert? A reed waved by the wind, or a man dressed softly? Those who are dressed softly live in the palace of kings. What did you go to see? A prophet! Yes, I say to you, and more than a prophet: for it is from him that it was written: Here it is that I send my angel before you, to prepare the way where you must walk. Then the publicans who were baptized with John's baptism, glorified the righteousness of God. What greater praise can the Savior make of John than to say that he is more than a prophet? The Savior goes on proclaiming blessed who has not been scandalized because of him; how could he have praised John who would have been scandalized by doubting the person of the Savior? But no, John Baptist did not doubt for a moment. The praises Jesus gives him prove that he is truly happy because he was not scandalized because of him. Why, indeed, does the

Savior choose this very moment to make such a glorious eulogy of John the precursor? It is to show that the spirit of John was not worked by doubt. John, knowing that his death was near, and wishing to fortify his disciples in the Savior's faith, wanted him to confirm with his own mouth what he had taught them of his divine person. It is therefore to confirm the truth of his testimony that he has recourse to a more excellent authority, so that before this agreement of two witnesses, no doubt is possible. John the Baptist therefore thinks he ought to employ this means of sending his disciples who seem to doubt his words, so that when he hears the same teachings from the mouth of the Savior, their faith is confirmed by this persuasion. that the testimony of the Lord descended from heaven and that of his worthy representative could not be doubted. The Savior seems to be responding to John himself, so that his disciples could learn the truth by bringing John's question closer to the Savior's answer.

(Matthew 3:14; John 1:31-33)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 58. FOR WHAT REASON CAN JOHN THE BAPTIST DENY THAT HE KNEW CHRIST BEFORE HIS BAPTISM, WHEN HE TOLD HIM WHEN HE APPROACHED HIM TO BE BAPTIZED: "IT IS I WHO MUST BE BAPTIZED BY YOU, AND YOU COME TO ME?" HOW DID HE NOT KNOW WHO HE FORBADE BAPTIZING BY HUMBLING HIMSELF DEEPLY BEFORE HIM? —** John the Baptist was raised from his cradle to such eminent sanctity that one cannot admit either that he could have been deceived or misled others, nor that he did not know his Lord, who in the bosom of his mother had filled him with the brightest lights by the Holy Spirit. It is certain that he knew him when the Holy Spirit descended on him and he was not without knowing him before he came to him to be baptized. Yes, he knew him, but he did not know if he was the one who was to bring to the earth the gift that God had previously promised to the patriarchs. This is what he says he knew when he saw the Holy Spirit coming down on him. This is, indeed, the sign that God had given him: "He on whom you will see the Holy Spirit come down and rest, it is he who baptizes in the Holy Spirit." (Jn. 1:33) The apostle testifies to the same truth when he says, "I say that

Jesus Christ was the minister of the gospel to the circumcised Jews, to verify the word of God, and to confirm the promises made to our fathers." (Rom. 15:8) This is what John the Baptist did not know in the Lord; for although his greatness was not unknown to him, he did not know, however, that it was through him that the promises made to Abraham were to be fulfilled.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(Matthew 5:17)	(Matthew 5:17)

**QUESTION 69. IF THE LAW HAS CEASED TO BE OBLIGATORY TO THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST OR THE SAVIOR, HOW CAN WE EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF OUR LORD: "I DID NOT COME TO DESTROY THE LAW OR THE PROPHETS, BUT TO FULFILL IT?" IF IT WERE FORBIDDEN TO OBSERVE IT, WAS IT NOT DESTROYED BY LOSING THE AUTHORITY IT HAD OVER THE CONDUCT OF MEN? — All that was predicted of Jesus Christ was accomplished, and our Lord Himself fulfilled the law and the prophets when He did all that the Scriptures had said of Him; he destroyed nothing, but confirmed all things. It was he who had been the object of the prophetic oracles, and the predictions concerning him no longer have to wait for fulfillment after him; just as after him the prophets could not make similar predictions, because they had no object and the one they had**

**QUESTION 13. IF THE LAW HAD TO STOP AT THE PREACHING OF THE SAVIOR OR OF JOHN THE BAPTIST, HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF THE SAVIOR: I DID NOT COME TO DESTROY THE LAW OR THE PROPHETS, BUT TO FULFILL THEM? IF THE LAW CEASED TO EXIST, HOW WAS IT NOT DESTROYED, SINCE IT LOST ITS STRENGTH AND AUTHORITY? — The oracles of the prophets who announced the coming of the Messiah, received their fulfillment at his coming. When the object of a prediction comes true, it is accomplished. The law which, as we have said, was given for a time, ceases with the time that it was forbidden for it to go beyond, because it then received its fulfillment. The law would have lost its authority, it would have seemed destroyed, if it had not ceased at the appointed time. A successor is given to a man of dignity, will it be said that he is destroyed? The law**

predicted had come. They have embraced everything in their writings, they have foretold his incarnation, his life, his passion, his resurrection, the manifestation of his divinity, the judgment to come, and therefore their prophetic ministry had to cease when the work they predicted was fulfilled. Now, the law has ceased in two ways, but not entirely, because what has ceased can still remain if one remains in the condition of the law. We must distinguish here in what has ceased the sentence of the law, of the law itself. When John the Baptist preached the baptism of penance for the remission of sins, the sentence of the law that declared sinners guilty ceased, so were the burdens of the law that were imposed upon the Jews because of the hardness of their hearts, like the precepts which had for their object food, new moon, sabbath, or other similar things. The reign of justice was to give place to the reign of mercy. The fear of suffering himself from what he was forbidden to do to others kept him away from any act of aggression. But the Savior elevates this commandment to a much higher degree of righteousness: "For my sake I say to you not to resist evil, but if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, show him the left," (Matt. 5:39; Luke 6:29) and thus offers the means of being perfect to one who does not render evil for evil. To render evil for evil is an act of justice, but which is far from being full and complete; to conceal the injury

would have been truly destroyed if it had been denounced, accused when it was in all its force. And notice that the Savior does not say that He filled, but fulfilled the law and the prophets. Now, the word accomplish means to add to make complete. What is adding to the prophets? It is to establish the worship of God under the name of the Trinity. No doubt the prophets taught and took back the people in the name of God, but this mystery remained hidden. To fulfill the law is to add new precepts to the ancients, for example: "You have learned that the ancients have been told: an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. And I say to you not to resist abuse, but if anyone struck you on the right cheek, show him the left again." (Matt. 5:38-39) This is how the Savior fulfill the law. He does not destroy it, he adds to it more perfect precepts, not to condemn as guilty the one who avenges himself, but to show that it is more perfect not to avenge himself. He wanted only what is contained in the law well understood, but he perfected the intention of the law. To teach justice to man, and to save him by the same, the law condemned him who had snatched an eye to lose an eye himself; The law wanted to inspire men with fear, to turn them away from doing what they would not have done to them, and to find their salvation in observing this precept. But since the human race is fragile and prone to sin, it exposes itself to suffer what it does not want to

we have received, that is the full and perfect justice. The vengeance that comes from evil can give satisfaction for a moment, but one gets an eternal joy by returning this vengeance to the future judgment. The Savior has thus fulfilled the law by making more just those to whom the law teaches justice, without being able to do more. It is therefore a real joy for the law to see its disciples more educated. The Savior had destroyed the law if he had taught men to sin with impunity. Now, it differs from rendering the sentence to leave to the one who has misused the time of repentance; if he does not profit by it, this sentence falls all the more severe on him, because he did not wish to acknowledge that God had delayed it only to give him time to correct himself.

be done to it. The Savior therefore changed the terms of the law and taught what is truly helpful to salvation to fulfill the true meaning of the law. The fear of law being powerless to save men, they would be thus overcome by patience and brought to correct themselves. This precept was given so that men of mild morals could find life in the exercise of patience, by not rendering harm to those who do them, by not rendering evil to those who make them of it, and that if they wish to correct themselves, the good ones could benefit from it, and the wicked a double punishment. Therefore, justice has not been destroyed, since we see it exercised by the Apostles, and Peter has used it against Ananias and Sapphire. (Acts 5:1) The chosen vessel, far from rejecting it, made use of it itself by blinding the magician Elymas who resisted the voice of the Lord. (Acts 13:11) There is yet another point where the law has been fulfilled. Our Lord says, "You have heard that it has been said, You will love your neighbor, and you will hate your enemy. But I say to you, Love your enemies." (Matt. 5:43) He adds to the law, that is, he does it, because he does not destroy the old commandments, but he adds to it more excellent precepts to lead men to perfection. The enemies, that is, the wicked, could not have been corrected and made better by the punishment permitted by justice. Our Lord wants to save them

	<p>by love and benevolence, which is what the law contained in its womb. His intention was to remove all enmity, and men, terrified of the punishment which threatened them, ceasing to be at war with one another. But men have gone so far as to despise the fear of the law and of nature; they have become day by day worse; it was then that the Savior wanted to triumph over these enmities by humility, so that men would be brought back to good by seeing that they were not made enmity for enmity, and that those who persevered in feelings of hatred punished more severely, since they could not be vanquished by the humility of the one they should have felt just revenge. The justice that exerts vengeance has not been destroyed, it is only suspended in both cases. It has ceased for the one who knows himself; it rigorously punishes the one who is rebellious to his prescriptions.</p>
--	--

(Matthew 5:25)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 70.** OUR LORD CERTAINLY COMMANDS US TO BE ENEMIES OF THE DEVIL; WHY, THEN, DOES HE TELL US IN THE GOSPEL: "DO YOU FIGHT TO BE RECONCILED WITH YOUR ADVERSARY?" WHO IS THE MAN'S ADVERSARY, IF NOT THE DEVIL?  
— There is no doubt that the devil is the enemy of man and especially of the

faithful Christian. It is against the servants of God that he sharpens his most formidable features. In the same way that the demon is the enemy of the good, so the law is opposed to the wicked, for who is not opposed to the one who despises it? The Lord thus warns the sinner to agree with the commandments which condemn his disobedience, to submit to their will, and to become a friend instead of an enemy, as he was. Indeed, the contemper of the law is his enemy because he resists his will. The Lord therefore exhorts the sinner to be reconciled to the law by his good works, lest it accuse him before the judge on the day of judgment, and then be condemned to the just punishments of his contempt for the law. For, says the Savior, the doctrine of the Lord is an enemy of every man who desires to do evil; if he does not agree with it, he will be thrown into hell that has been prepared for the devil, the true enemy of the human race.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
<b>(Matthew 5:44; Revelation 6:10)</b>  <b>QUESTION 68.</b> OUR LORD COMMANDS US TO PRAY FOR OUR ENEMIES, HOW THEN TO EXPLAIN THIS PLACE OF REVELATION, WHERE THE SOULS OF THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN KILLED ASK GOD TO AVENGE THEM? (REV. 6:10) — The souls of those who were put to death demanded revenge as the blood of Abel cried out for vengeance from the earth (Gen. 4:10); it is the facts themselves that cry out for vengeance even though they are deprived of language. What, indeed, does the blood ask for, except that it is avenged, and it cries out for vengeance not by speaking, but by the very fact of its	<b>(Matthew 5:44; Revelation 6:10)</b>  <b>QUESTION 12.</b> THE LORD HAS TAUGHT US TO PRAY FOR OUR ENEMIES, SO WHY DO THE SOULS OF THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN KILLED ASK TO BE AVENGED AND IMPLORE THIS VENGEANCE OF THE LORD? (REV. 6:10) — The author of the Apocalypse, predicting the future calamities and tribulations by which the righteousness of God should punish the ungodliness and crimes of men, and by showing from the look of enlightened faith the punishment of every sin says that the souls of those who have been slain cry vengeance night and day to prove that no act of impiety or cruelty will go unpunished.

bestowal? It is thus said that a work praises the one who made it by that alone that it rejoices his eyes. The saints are not so impatient that they urge God to do what they know must be done at the appointed time and whose fulfillment cannot be anticipated or deferred. Saint John wanted to teach us by these words that God would one day avenge the blood of his saints, lest the patience he uses make him believe in the impunity of this impious war that is made to the saints, and at the same time to inspire the persecutors of the servants of God with dread and to encourage those who suffer for his name. The soul of the sufferer regains courage when she learns that they will be avenged by a powerful hand. They are full of hope at the thought that their death has not the approval of their judge, for they are certain then of their innocence. God is merciful and patient, but he acts with great moderation. He expects the ungodly to open their hearts to faith and sinners to convert; if they do not profit by this grace, they will be punished for having despised the long patience of God. Now, he gives us examples of this truth even in the time when his mercy is announced so that his patience is not treated with insensibility which cannot be touched, neither by the sufferings, nor by the feelings of the piety. This is why he says through his prophet, "I am silent, but will I keep quiet?" (Isa. 42:14) and Our Lord Himself: "Will not God do

Now, there is nothing in this that is contrary to the precept of the Lord. Indeed, God is the author of this law, after having exercised his vengeance on the day of judgment. This precept is therefore for the present life, and the souls of those who have been put to death are excusable, since they ask for vengeance while they are in possession of the other life. However, to give a truer explanation, it is the very fact of their shed blood that cries out here revenge. This fact is not silent, it does not stop asking for revenge. As God said to Cain, "The blood of your brother is crying out to me from the earth." (Gen. 4:10) What is the meaning of these words? It is that the very act of the crime demands justice and cries for vengeance; just as we say that the earth praises the Lord, because it is his work, although it has neither voice nor feeling. One cannot suppose in the saints either so much patience or so much ignorance that they ask God to avenge them before the day of judgment and that they urge him to do what they know they should not do to accomplish that at the time marked. This is what the Savior says in express terms: "Will not God do justice to his elect who cry to him night and day?"

<p>justice to his elect who cry to him day and night?" They shout in the manner we have said above. If, then, a Christian avenges himself here below without excessive rigor, and without shedding blood, he does not sin; it will be better, however, to abandon this vengeance to God, who is his judge.</p>	
--	--

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
<p><b>(Matthew 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 60. IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE ONLY IN EFFECT UNTIL JOHN THE BAPTIST, HOW DOES THE SAVIOR SEND LEPERS TO OFFER GIFTS TO PRIESTS FOR THE HEALING OF THEIR LEPROSY? —</b> This prescription was no longer in force, it is true, but the Savior imposes it on the lepers for the condemnation of the Jews. They had not understood that the sovereign truth was manifested more clearly to them in better days in the interest of their salvation; the truth was thus lowered to the point of accusing them. They looked upon the Savior as an enemy of the law, because in a feeling of mercy he wanted to deliver them from the heavy yoke of the law, according to this prophet Jeremiah's prophecy: "And I will establish among them a new covenant, not such as the</p>	<p><b>(Matthew 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 28. IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS LASTED UNTIL JOHN, WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SEND AN OFFERING TO THE PRIESTS FOR HEALING? —</b> This prescription was no longer in force, it is true, but the Savior imposes it on the lepers for the condemnation of the Jews. They had not understood that the sovereign truth was manifested more clearly to them in better days in the interest of their salvation; the truth was thus lowered to the point of accusing them. They looked upon the Savior as an enemy of the law, because in a feeling of mercy he wanted to deliver them from the heavy yoke of the law, according to this prophet Jeremiah's prophecy: "And I will establish among them a new covenant, not such as the covenant I gave to their fathers." (Jer. 31:32) And in order to establish that this step was to crush them, he adds:</p>

covenant I gave to their fathers." (Jer. 31:32) And in order to establish that this step was to crush them, he adds: "To bear witness to them," that is to say, that she was a witness against them who dared to say that the Savior was an enemy of the law. The apostle St. Paul imitated this example; he taught that one should no longer submit to circumcision, and yet he did not fail to circumcise Timothy to avoid scandalizing the Jews. He preferred to do a useless action than to excite agitation among the false brethren. But this approach only confirmed the Jews in error. This satisfaction which was then given them became the cause of an error in which they persevere still. The apostle St. Paul imitates this example. He taught that the precept of circumcision no longer forced anyone, and yet he circumcised Timothy to avoid scandalizing the Jews. He preferred doing a useless thing rather than being scandalous to some uneducated minds that could be saved. The Lord has much the same attitude towards the Jews to destroy the opinion they had formed of him, that he was an enemy of the traditions of the Jews. So he commanded the leper to offer to the priest for his healing the gifts prescribed by the law of Moses, and he added: "To bear witness to them," so that this was a testimony against them that the Savior was not an enemy of the law. He therefore prescribed an action which had ceased to be obligatory. But as useless things

"To bear witness to them," that is to say, that she was a witness against them who dared to say that the Savior was an enemy of the law. The apostle St. Paul imitated this example; he taught that one should no longer submit to circumcision, and yet he did not fail to circumcise Timothy to avoid scandalizing the Jews. He preferred to do a useless action than to excite agitation among the false brethren. But this approach only confirmed the Jews in error. This satisfaction which was then given them became the cause of an error in which they persevere still. The apostle St. Paul imitates this example. He taught that the precept of circumcision no longer forced anyone, and yet he circumcised Timothy to avoid scandalizing the Jews. He preferred doing a useless thing rather than being scandalous to some uneducated minds that could be saved. The Lord has much the same attitude towards the Jews to destroy the opinion they had formed of him, that he was an enemy of the traditions of the Jews. So he commanded the leper to offer to the priest for his healing the gifts prescribed by the law of Moses, and he added: "To bear witness to them," so that this was a testimony against them that the Savior was not an enemy of the law. He therefore prescribed an action which had ceased to be obligatory. But as useless things are not harmful for this reason, this step became even useful to those who had formed a bad opinion of it by

are not harmful for this reason, this step became even useful to those who had formed a bad opinion of it by giving them cause to convince themselves that the Savior was not an enemy of the law.	giving them cause to convince themselves that the Savior was not an enemy of the law.
--	---

(Matthew 11:3, Luke 7:19)

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 14. JOHN ASKS THE LORD: ARE YOU THE ONE TO COME, OR SHOULD WE EXPECT ANOTHER?** — John the Baptist pleads here under his name the cause of his disciples. We cannot admit the slightest doubt in the spirit of John, who said, "Behold, the Lamb of God, behold, he who takes away the sins of the world." It is therefore in the interest of his disciples that he send this request in his name, to give place to the Savior to confirm what he himself had taught them about his divine person, and so that after his death his disciples would follow Him without hesitation.

(Matthew 11:13, Luke 16:16)

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 15. WHY DID THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS LAST UNTIL JOHN, AND THEN CEASE TO EXIST? BECAUSE THE ONE THEY ANNOUNCED HAD ARRIVED. BUT WHY DID THE LAW ONLY LAST UNTIL JOHN, SINCE THE APOSTLE TEACHES US THAT WE MUST BE SUBJECT TO THE LAW; FOR ALL THAT IS, SAYS HE, IS ESTABLISHED OF GOD?** — Under one name, the law contains three different meanings. The first part of the law has God as its object. The name of law, *lex*, comes from *lectio*, choice, because it teaches you what you must choose between several things. Men

in error have therefore received the law to help them choose the truth, that is, to make them choose God by renouncing the devil. The second part of the law is the one that includes the precepts, the first of which begins: "Honor your father and your mother." The third part deals with new moons, Sabbath-keeping, discernment, and the choice of food, circumcision and the sacrifices of animals. It is from this last part of the law that Our Lord says that it lasted only to John, and that henceforth it must not be observed any more. Because it was given to stop when its time would be accomplished; for it was not promulgated from the beginning, but for particular reasons, and for a fixed time, which was not to extend beyond the advent of the Savior. What remains then of the law is that which has God as its object, the precepts, and that which relates to the nature of God, which the Son of God, without doubt, cannot destroy. It is through him, in fact, that we tend towards the rewards we are promised; because fear produces attentive vigilance.

#### (Matthew 11:25-26)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 100. ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.** — You have heard, my dear brothers, what our Lord says in his Gospel: "I give you glory, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and the prudent, and you revealed them to the little ones. Yes, my Father, because it pleased you so. "(Matt. 11:25-26) If we are to weigh the meaning of these words of Our Lord, we will see that they are meant to encourage the faithful, those who, because they despise the wisdom of the world, appear small in the eyes of the sages of the world, who, without any merit, claim to be wise, and so God has judged it unworthy of him to discover the truth; is to the humble who do not presume of themselves and submit to the divine will, that justice requires that he reveal his secrets. He is cautious in the eyes of God, and truly careful of his salvation, who prefers to his knowledge the law of God, which he sees supported not by the proud noise of words, but on authentic testimonies of the divine power. And, indeed, it is at once a folly and a vanity to put one's confidence in something that has no support for the power of God. It is not therefore to the cultivated minds of the age that God promises his kingdom, but to the faithful; it is not those that examine the

stars, but to those who do good that eternity is promised; it is not to the dialecticians who endeavor to obscure the truth by their sophisms and the subtlety of their reasonings that he grants glory, but to those who are more careful to do well than to say well. God condemns those who prefer brilliant speeches to good works. It is to want to bring back to oneself the glory of God, to pretend to put on the truths of God the ornaments of the word. These truths must please themselves, it is not the words that express them, it is the very meaning of these words which is worthy of praise. If it is the meaning that gives birth to the expressions, and if the words were invented only to express the truth, why not express it purely and simply, so that it inspires us more easily the desire to save our soul. That is why Our Lord has chosen as apostles simple men, without letters and without ploys, by their perseverance in faith and by a holy life, to burst in them the truth of God. This is what makes the Apostle St. Paul say: "And I, my brethren, when I came, did not come with the brilliance of eloquence and human wisdom." (1 Cor. 2:1) And in another place: "The kingdom of God does not consist in words but in virtue." (1 Cor. 4:20) For words are subject to contradiction, but virtue makes a striking witness to the law of God, and the most sublime speeches are lowered before it. These considerations, my dear brothers, are made in the interest of the simple minds who might think themselves unworthy of the grace of God, because they do not know the secrets of oratorical art, while their simplicity is rather for them a privilege; for what the wise men of the world do not see being blinded by the pride of human science, simple souls believe it, because their prudence consists not in words, but in true wisdom. They know that God rested complacently in good works, and that he asks rather for faith rather than the elegance of speeches: "On whom shall I rest," he says by his prophet, "otherwise on the one who is humble and meek, and hears my words with trembling?" (Isa. 66: 2) If we therefore want to be worthy of the rewards we are promised, we must fulfill the Lord's commandments in the assurance that God loves those who keep his words, which the Savior says to his disciples: "If you love me, keep my commandments," (Jn. 14:15) so that after being faithful servants of God we will become the heirs of His kingdom by Our Lord Jesus Christ.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(Matthew 12:1-8; Mark 2:23-28; Luke 6:1-5)	(Matthew 12:1-8; Mark 2:23-28; Luke 6:1-5)

**QUESTION 61.** WHY DID THE SAVIOR, RESPONDING TO THE JEWS WHO ACCUSED THE DISCIPLES OF BREAKING THE SABBATH BY CRUSHING EARS OF CORN IN THEIR HANDS TO EAT THEM, BRING THEM THE EXAMPLE OF DAVID, WHO HAD EATEN BREADS THAT WERE PERMITTED TO BE SLAUGHTERED? ONLY TO THE PRIESTS, AN EXAMPLE WHICH, FAR FROM JUSTIFYING THEM, MAKES THEM GUILTY OF THE SAME FAULT AS DAVID, WHO, MOREOVER, DID NOT DO THIS ACTION ON A SABBATH DAY (1 SAM. 21:4). — The Savior wants to confuse the hypocrisy of the Jews with many examples. He therefore cites to them greater transgressions under the law without anyone having dared to accuse them, he shows the Sabbath violated several times in the law, the breads reserved for priests eaten by the priests by those who were not, and these transgressions having as authors men who enjoyed great authority under the law. The first was Joshua, the son of Nave, who, by the command of God himself, did not observe the Sabbath day and saw the walls of Jericho fall on his approach (Josh. 1:20). It was therefore very useful to him to have obeyed the command of

**QUESTION 23.** BECAUSE THE JEWS ACCUSED THE DISCIPLES OF TRANSGRESSING THE LAW BY TEARING OFF THE EARS OF THE SABBATH, THE SAVIOR BROUGHT THE EXAMPLE OF DAVID SAYING TO THEM, DO YOU NOT KNOW WHAT DAVID DID WHEN HE WAS HUNGRY, HOW HE TOOK THE BREAD OF PROPOSAL, ATE IT, AND GAVE IT TO THOSE WHO WERE WITH HIM, WHICH WAS PERMITTED ONLY TO THE PRIESTS ALONE? HOWEVER, THIS EXAMPLE DOES NOT SEEM TO EXCUSE THE DISCIPLES, WHO CAN BE PREVARICATORS OF THE LAW AS WELL AS DAVID WAS. —The Savior would not refute the accusation of the Jews for this reason that the Sabbath law had ceased to be obligatory; he did not judge them worthy to hear openly the truth because of their unbelief. He thus opposed them with reasons borrowed at a time on which they rested with complacency, that is, at a time when the Sabbath law was in full force, to repel the accusation directed against his disciples. to tear off ears and grind them in their hands to eat them at a time when the Sabbath law had ceased to oblige. Our Lord, leaving aside this reason, shows them that in the very

God rather than the Sabbath law. The Maccabees, defeated in a first battle, delivered a second on the Sabbath and triumphed over their enemies (1 Mac. 2:38,41). David had already received the royal anointing and robbed the Philistine of his armies, whom he had killed by the power of God (1 Sam. 21:1). Now, finding himself on a journey, pressed by hunger, he received from the hands of the high priest some bread which he was forbidden to eat; but this defense was only out of necessity, which permitted its use. The high priest, before this necessity, gave him these loaves, and David, the chosen of God, did not hesitate to take them. It is the same with the Sabbath, so it is not forbidden to give circumcision on the Sabbath. Commands whose violation does not entail any danger must be observed; but if there is necessity, or can transgress them without any danger, because they have been given rather to impress a certain respect than as necessary to salvation. On the contrary, what is forbidden absolutely is never allowed, and transgression, whatever the necessity, is always harmful. What laws prohibit as essentially bad is always forbidden. As for the precepts of which we have said that transgression is sometimes permitted, it is for example the ages of obligation, which we may not observe in case of necessity without being guilty, if we are authorized by the weakness of the stomach or disease.

time when the law of the Sabbath had all its strength, the Sabbath law was broken in case of necessity. Thus David did what was not permitted him; Joshua did what the law forbade when he commanded his armed soldiers to go round Jericho for seven days; the Maccabees paid what was forbidden to them by defending on the Sabbath. And the priests, adds the Savior, violate the Sabbath in the temple and are not guilty. He thus shows that the accusation of the Jews against the disciples was for malice more than error, since despite these examples that they knew of holy personages who had deliberately violated the Sabbath, they did not leave any doubt to accuse innocent people. The law of the Sabbath was obligatory, but if necessity required it, one was not guilty by not observing it. So it was not forbidden to circumcise the Sabbath day because there was need. Thus the disciples took ears, which the ancient law forbade, but the hunger which pressed them legitimized this action. So again David, also hungry, did what he was not allowed, knowing that hunger excused him. It is the same today for the fasts prescribed by law. Is a sick person guilty of breaking the fast? No, no doubt, because this transgression is without any danger. It is sometimes allowed, such as breaking the Sabbath under the old law. What, on the contrary, is never permitted does not admit the excuse derived from necessity.

The Jews did not ignore it, and their accusation against the disciples of breaking the Sabbath law was not sincere. Now, the Savior did not wish to oppose to them the time of the law which touched his soul in order not to irritate them more, but he fights their calumnious accusation by examples taken in the past much more favorable for them in the defense of the Sabbath and, as we have said above, he confounds them not only on the Sabbath article, but on the breads reserved for priests.

**(Matthew 15, Luke 7;17)**

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 17. WHY DOES THE SAVIOR BEGIN TO REFUSE TO HAVE COMPASSION ON A FOREIGN WOMAN, THAT IS, THE CANANEAN (MATT.15), WHILE GRANTING THE BLESSING OF SALVATION TO THE CENTURION WHO WAS A STRANGER AND TO THE LEPER WHOM HE DECLARES HIMSELF NOT TO BE OF THE PEOPLE OF GOD? (LUKE 7:17)**

— The Savior's action finds its justification in the nature of the fact itself. It was unreasonable indeed and insulting to the promises made to the patriarchs, that a woman who did not recognize the God of the Jews, received a favor promised to the nation that adored her. Jesus began to deny her this grace. But as soon as she humbled herself by believing in the words of the Savior, and confessed that the Jews who believed were the children, and that the Gentiles were dogs or servitors, she unites with the Lord's faith; for the servants suppose the master, and there is no master without servants; from then on, the union settled between this woman who submitted to God and the people who were subjected to it. That's why she

deserves what she asked for. As for the centurion, who immediately received from the Savior the benefit he beseeched, he had for a long time occupied himself with the things of God. Indeed, the chiefs of the Jews give him this testimony before the Lord: "It is worthy that you grant him this grace, and he has built us a synagogue." As for the leper, Our Lord calls him a stranger not by his faith but by the nation to which he belonged. Indeed, he was a Samaritan of those who were Babylonians of origin. And yet it was to the confession of his faith that he had the benefit of his cure; for our Lord had said to his disciples, "Go not to the nations, and do not go into the cities of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matt. 10) That is to say, he recommends them to preach the gospel to the Jews who had received the promise rather than to the Samaritans and Gentiles. But as soon as the Jews began to reject the faith of Jesus Christ which was offered to them, the Savior presented himself to the Samaritan woman, and to Cornelius the Centurion after his crucifixion, while he contented himself with welcoming the Cananean who sought him, because the time had not yet come to offer the Gentiles the grace of salvation.

### (Matthew 17:26)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 75. WHY DOES THE LORD ONLY PAY THE DIDRACHM FOR HIMSELF AND PETER, AND NOT FOR THE OTHER APOSTLES? SINCE ALL HAD ABANDONED THEIR PROPERTY TO FOLLOW HIM, WAS HE NOT TO PAY THIS TRIBUTE FOR ALL?** — This didrachm was a personal tribute, not the tax on the property of each. (This tax was called rags gold, because it was demanded of the poor themselves.) For the Savior possessed nothing in this world, though he was putting it out of the world. After his death, he was buried at the expense of others; and we, to whom the world is a stranger, desire to increase our goods; it is thus that in dying we attest not only by our words, but by our writings, that we have invaded the world, and that our own declaration makes us condemn by the sovereign matter of this world. This is why the Lord says in the Gospel: "He who has not abandoned all things to follow me cannot be my disciple." (Luke 14:26) Therefore whoever possesses the goods of this world without placing

his hope in it, and being willing to renounce it for faith, walks in the way that leads to our Lord Jesus Christ. This tribute was therefore demanded of those who traded or practiced any profession. Now, since neither the Savior nor his disciples were involved in any of the affairs of this world, we should not ask them this tax. But as the demon was constantly in ambush to seize the opportunity to triumph over the Savior, he seized the soul of the collectors of the didrachm to make them the instruments of his will and inspire them to go find Peter, the first of the apostles, and to tell him that their master had to pay this tax when they were perfectly discharged; for they did not engage in any of the occupations of the world. Since the Savior did not have enough to pay this tax, the devil wanted to make it scandalous or force him to lower himself to beg another to pay for him. It was then that Our Lord, to show that the devil, in his improvidence, was weaving out frames where he was to be taken himself, commanded his apostle to go to the seashore, to open the mouth of the first fish he would find and take the coin required for this tax. In paying for this tribute, he not only avoided scandalizing those who were in charge of collecting it, and he did not need to go so far as to ask others to pay for him, but he gave proof of his great power by drawing to himself those who were in the chains of the devil, to make him find his torment in his own inventions and in his ploys. The collectors of the didrachma therefore told the apostle Saint Peter: "Your master does not pay the tribute, etc.; And they went to find his master to make him pay this tax for all the disciples. The Savior, in commanding to pay him for Peter and for himself, seems to pay him for all his disciples; for just as they were all in the Savior as the disciples in their master, so after the Savior they were all combined in Peter; "For our Lord made him to be their leader and the shepherd of the Lord's flock. In this way, Jesus said to his disciples, Watch and pray so as not to enter into temptation." (Matt. 26:41) But to Peter he says: "Behold, Satan has desired to sift you like wheat, and I have prayed for you, that your faith may not fail, and you, when you are converted, strengthen your brothers." (Luke 22:31) What doubt can remain? He prayed for Peter and did not pray for James and John, not to mention others. It is evident that they were all combined with Peter; for when he prays for Peter, one must recognize that he prays for all other disciples. It is always, in fact, in the one at his head that the people receive reproaches or praises. And our Lord Himself says in another place, "I pray for those whom my Father has given me, and be with me where I am." (Jn. 17:9,24)

**(Matthew 24:20)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 19.** WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "PRAY THAT YOUR FLIGHT WILL NOT COME IN WINTER OR ON THE SABBATH"; SINCE THE TIME OF THIS PERSECUTION CANNOT BE DIVIDED, ACCORDING TO THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTLE: "THE MAN OF SIN, THE SON OF PERDITION," HE SAYS, "WILL BE REVEALED IN HIS DAY"; (2 THESS. 2:3) AND HE SAYS AGAIN IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES: "DETERMINING THE TIMES OF THE DURATION OF PEOPLES AND THE LIMITS OF THEIR ABODE?" (ACTS 17) WHY, THEN, DOES THE SAVIOR LET US UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS NOT GOOD TO FLEE IN THE WINTER OR ON THE SABBATH? — The flight during the winter is not exempt from danger, the cold, the continual rains, the snow, the frost, the overflowing of the rivers, are all obstacles which make the flight very difficult. You cannot seek refuge in forests, mountains, or caves. On the Sabbath day, the Jews could not get far from the city or climb the mountains, and by the same escape was impossible that day. Now, just as these two circumstances leave all safety to flight because of the obstacles we have pointed out; thus our flight will not be safe from danger if this persecution finds us chained in servitude to the hindrances of the flesh. Indeed, the desires of the age or the goods of this world are so many chains that hold captive men and prevent them from escaping the tyrannical treatments of the devil. We must therefore pray that the difficulties of winter and the Sabbath do not come in the time when we will have to flee, but that God has relieved us of these obstacles and gives us his help, to destroy in us all desire that would make us slaves of the world. As the Savior spoke of the last persecution of which the Antichrist is the author, he takes as a term of comparison the winter which is the last season of the year, and the Sabbath which is the last day of the week, for us to make it clear that if flight is painful and difficult in these two circumstances, the persecutions and trials of this last time will be so heavy and so overwhelming that there will be hardly anyone who can escape it.

**(Matthew 26:32; Mark 14:28)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 20.** WHEN THE SAVIOR FORETOLD HIS PASSION AND RESURRECTION THREE DAYS AFTER HIS DEATH, HE ADDED, "AFTER I AM RISEN, I WILL GO BEFORE YOU TO GALILEE, WHERE YOU WILL SEE ME." THE ANGEL HOLDS THE SAME LANGUAGE TO THE HOLY WOMEN, AND YET HE WAS SEEN IN JERUSALEM BY THE DISCIPLES AND BY THE HOLY WOMEN THEMSELVES. — The words of the Savior cannot be doubted without being guilty of unbelief; but, as I see, you do not doubt the words of the Savior; you only want to know why he says that his disciples will see him in Galilee, whereas he appeared to them in Jerusalem after his passion. Now he appeared in the city of Jerusalem, but only a few of his disciples to console them, while he manifested himself to all in Galilee. He therefore recommends to those who had seen him in Jerusalem only a small number to go to Galilee, where he was to manifest himself to all and formulate the precepts which were to serve as a foundation and rule for Christian discipline.

**(Matthew 27:3-10)**

**QUESTION 94.** DID JUDAS ISCARIOT, WHO BETRAYED OUR LORD, HANG HIMSELF BEFORE THE SAVIOR'S PASSION? — Our Lord was delivered into the hands of his enemies, and it was on the morning of the day of preparation, when all the princes of the priests, the scribes, and the elders of the people, gathered in the house of Caiaphas, where they knew that they had to bring Jesus in order to hear him. This is what the Evangelists St. Matthew and St. Mark report, and from their story none of them went out of the house of Caiaphas before this work of impiety was consummated, for all their zeal, all their religion for Passover celebration had only one object, the death of the Savior. But since the princes of the priests were busy from the morning until the ninth hour to press the execution of the death of the Savior, how could one admit that Judas had postponed the price of his betrayal to them before the crucifixion and that he had told them in the temple: "I sinned, delivering innocent blood?" (Matt. 27:4) It is certain, indeed,

that not all princes of priests and elders of the people were in the temple before the death of the Savior, and one proof is that they insulted when he was on the cross. It cannot be concluded either from what this fact is told before the passion of Our Lord; for it is a great number of facts which, although having passed before, are nevertheless recounted last, just as when the opportunity arises, the sacred writers anticipate the narrative of a fact which took place only after. Thus it is evident that Psalm fifty is earlier than the third. It sometimes happens that later events are told in anticipation. So again it is proved that Mary after the resurrection of her brother Lazarus, six days before the feast of Easter, had scattered perfumes on the feet of the Lord in a feast, and the Evangelist anticipates the story of this fact because of its signification. Mary, he says, was the one who spread perfumes on the Lord. (Jn. 11:2) St. John tells this fact before Lazarus' death, and if we did not learn that it took place after, we would not know when it place it. Perhaps it might be said that Judas postponed the money at the ninth hour, and seeing the Savior put to death, the torn veil of the temple, the earth quaking, the rocks breaking, the elements upset (Matt. 27:51), he conceived under the inspiration of fear, the repentance of his crime. But at the ninth hour, the elders and princes of the priests were entirely, it seems to me, preparing for the Passover that they were to celebrate on the evening of that day. Besides, the law forbade carrying money on the Sabbath. I believe, therefore, that the day or the time when Judas hung himself cannot be fixed in a plausible way.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(Matthew 27:45; Luke 23:44; John 19:14; Mark 15:25)	Matthew 27:45; Luke 23:44; John 19:14; Mark 15:25)
<b>QUESTION 65.</b> IF THE EVANGELISTS HAD THE SAME THOUGHT, THE SAME LANGUAGE, HOW IS IT THAT WHEN THREE OF THEM, ST. MATTHEW, ST. LUKE AND ST. JOHN, SAY THAT THE SAVIOR WAS CRUCIFIED IN THE SIXTH	<b>QUESTION 21.</b> SENTENCE IS PRONOUNCED. BUT IT SEEMS CERTAIN THAT IT WAS BETWEEN THE FIFTH AND SIXTH HOURS THAT PILATE SAT DOWN ON HIS TRIBUNAL, AND PRONOUNCED SENTENCE, AS ST. JOHN TELLS IT. — It is not good

HOUR, ST. MARK, ON THE CONTRARY, REPORTS THAT HE WAS AT THE THIRD HOUR? — It is not good to wrap the truth in obscure language. The three evangelists had only one thought, but Saint Mark wanted to mention a circumstance they had omitted and thought necessary. Indeed, it can not be supposed that this evangelist who, following the example of the other sacred writers, was educated with a deep sense of religion and a scrupulous care of what he wrote, and who was inspired by the Holy Spirit, could have made a mistake. It is therefore necessary to examine what his purpose was in expressing himself in this way. Let us first consider that it was not by Pilate but by the Jews that the Savior was crucified, for, according to the Roman laws, he declared that Jesus was innocent. Is not he the one who says to the Jews, "I find no crime in him?" (Jn. 19:4) They cry to him, "Crucify him," and he answers them, What crime hath he done? Finally, as he insisted and wished to draw it from their hands, they had recourse to this slanderous accusation: "If you deliver this man you are not Caesar's friend, for whoever makes himself king, is decreed against Caesar. It is then that He gives them the Savior to be judged by them. Pilate did not pronounce the sentence, but the Jews. It was at the instigation of the leaders of the priests, says the evangelist, that they shouted to him: "Let him be crucified." St.

to wrap the truth in obscure language. The agreement of the three evangelists is proof that they have spoken the truth. As to St. Mark, his account indicates that he wished to make known to us a circumstance which remained hidden. For it cannot be supposed that this evangelist, who, like the other sacred authors, had learned with as much religion as care what he should write, has fallen into error. We must therefore carefully examine what he wanted to teach us by expressing himself in this way. For it is not without reason that he departs here from the three other evangelists. Let us consider whether those who claim that the sentence was pronounced at the third hour, and that therefore the Savior was crucified at this time, are not right, although they cannot prove the truth of their feeling. They see this truth, but they do not know how to establish it. Let us, then, leave Pilate's person for a moment and see how far the sentence pronounced against the Savior can be traced, and we shall see then whether we can admit as true the sentiment of which we have just spoken. It is certain that it was at the instigation of the priests of the priests that the Jews demanded that Barabbas be delivered to them on the day of the feast, and that Jesus was crucified. Pilate resisted them long because he wanted to deliver the Savior; He returned and went out several times to speak to the Jews and tell them that he found no crime in him

Mark therefore wished to make us understand that the sentence was pronounced at the third hour, when they repeated with their repeated cries that Jesus was crucified within the interval of nearly three hours, during which Jesus was taken to Herod's house and brought back to Pilate. In fact, every man condemned to death is regarded as dead from the moment the death sentence has been sentenced to him. St. Mark thus clearly establishes that it is not by virtue of the judge's sentence that Jesus was crucified; for it is difficult to prove the innocence of one who is condemned by a judicial sentence. He spoke in a different way to tell us that what was done in the sixth hour, not by law, but by the persevering malice of the Jews, began at the third hour.

that was worthy of death. But the Jews insisted with greater force by shouting, "Let him be crucified. There was therefore a certain space of time during which Jesus was exposed to the mockery of the soldiers, who presented him to the people, clothed him with a rag of purple, and crowned with thorns, worshipped him in mockery, they spat in his face, flogged him, and suffered him, which led him to the sixth hour when Jesus was crucified. He was brought to Pilate, Pilate went out to come to the Jews, because they did not enter the courtroom themselves. He spoke to them, heard their false accusations, and sent Jesus to Herod. Then he came back, questioned again Jesus who answered him; then he went out again to the Jews and declared to them that he found no cause of death in the Savior. We had arrived at the third hour. Then the Jews told Pilate who wanted to deliver Jesus, "Let him be crucified." Pilate resisted them for a long time, but being unable to obtain anything, he left Jesus at their will about the sixth hour, as the Evangelist expressly said: "He gave him to them to do what they wanted." It is therefore true to say that the sentence of death was pronounced at the third hour, because it was not pronounced by Pilate, but by the Jews. Pilate consented to it only with regret and in spite of himself because of the perilous intimation that they sounded in his ears: "If you deliver him, you are not

	Caesar's friend." Let us see what St. Mark wanted to show that it was not by the sentence of the judge that the Savior had been condemned, because it is difficult for him who is sentenced by a truly judicial sentence, not to appear put to death with justice.
--	--

(Matthew 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:42)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 55. WHY DID THE LORD WANT TO BE CRUCIFIED ON THE EIGHTH DAY OF THE CALENDAR OF APRIL, THE TIME OF THE PASSOVER CELEBRATION FOR THE JEWS? —** The Savior did all things in their place and in their time. To show that he created the world and all that it contains by the will of the Father, he wanted to redeem the world and renew it with his passion at the time he created it, that is to say in the equinox where the world began and the day becomes longer than the night. As he lived in the middle of the Roman Empire, he had to suffer the eighth day of the calends of April, time of the equinox of the Romans. It was then, in fact, that the year spread over this part of the world and the day began to grow. The passion of the Savior led him from darkness to light. The conduct of the Creator is therefore safe from blame, since he repaired his fallen creature at the very time he created it. One can find nothing wrong with the time of the creation of a fallen thing when its repair takes place at the same time, and God wanted the joy of the renewal of the creature to take place on the very day of its inauguration.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(Matthew 28:1-8; Mark 16:1-8; Luke 24:1-12; John 20:1-13)	(Matthew 28:1-8; Mark 16:1-8; Luke 24:1-12; John 20:1-13)

**QUESTION 64.** HOW CAN ONE PROVE THAT THE SAVIOR ROSE FROM THE DEAD AFTER THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS? — If you seek here the number followed by days and nights, you will not be able to understand these words: Moses has hunted forty days and forty nights (Exod. 24:18); However, this number is not entirely present, for the day on which he ascended, and the day on which he descended, are not strictly part of it. But the custom is not to count the night without counting the day, not to count either the day without the night, taking the part for the whole. It is in this sense that the Savior said, "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so the son of man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." (Matt. 12:40) As there were three nights, there are also three days. Night is mentioned not to appear to express something new and contrary to reason, since night is a consequence of the day. There is no doubt that the evening which is followed by the night was established before the light that gave birth to the day, and nothing absurd is advanced in asserting that the passion of the Lord began with the night. Just as light, that is, day, is the image of life, so night, that is, darkness, is the symbol of death; it is thus that

**QUESTION 18.** HOW CAN ONE PROVE THE TRUTH OF THESE WORDS OF THE SAVIOR, THAT HE WOULD RISE FROM THE DEAD AFTER THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS, SINCE AFTER SUFFERING THE TORMENTS OF HIS PASSION ON THE DAY OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, HE RESURRECTED FIRST LIGHT OF SUNDAY WHEN DARKNESS STILL COVERED THE EARTH? THE NUMBER OF DAYS AND NIGHTS DOES NOT SEEM TO FIT. — The Savior, who foresaw all that was to happen to him, made this statement loudly, he knew with no doubt that the Jews would seize him to put him to death, and that he would oppose no resistance. to their sacrilegious effects, while it was so easy for them to thwart them. Was not he already their captive when he healed the ear of the high priest's servant whom Peter had cut off with a sword? He showed them that his humiliations were not the result of his weakness, but that by a providential disposition he yielded for a time to their criminal will to destroy thus the kingdom of hell. Indeed, the demon, in his improvidence, slipped into the soul of the Jews to push them to put the Savior to death, as if he had to win by being the life to him who taught the

Scripture itself establishes a striking contrast between the children of light and the children of darkness. Now, it is not surprising that although, always and everywhere, the day is placed before night, the light before darkness; here, however, the things which follow are placed before those which preceded them, or that in the present case the order is reversed, as we have already remarked. Indeed, the night seems much cleaner to be the image of death than the day. Death thus begins with the night, because it was impossible to find another way than by night in the empire of the prince of darkness and to triumph over him. It was necessary for the Lord of light, that is, of eternal life, to be for a moment subject to the prince of darkness or death, in order to become the liberator of all those upon whom death had reigned in the past, or would like to expand his empire in the future. Neither death would have been entirely destroyed, nor the clouds of darkness would have been dispelled, had it not been for the Lord to enter his empire. Before this bright light, the secret of death, in which all his strength was, vanishes, and one can only triumph entirely over him who is caught by his own arms or in his own domains. It is therefore by a design full of wisdom that in this great drama the night gets the pre-eminence to lose all its power. So that the unbelieving Jews would remain wrapped up in an eternal night, and that the day would not

way of truth; and he did not know that death must turn against himself. It was then that he triumphed at the sight of the servitude in which the man had fallen as a result of his sin, that he was convinced of the crime of having put to death the innocent Christ, held captive among the sinners he who did not know sin, and thus lost the very ones on whom his power was stretched in the underworld. It is in the divine prescience that the Savior had of all these things that he counts for his death the night he was taken by his enemies. In fact, every prisoner who has no hope of escaping the hands of his judge sees himself as dead even before the blow that must hit him. Add to this night the day of his passion and the next night. Add the Sabbath by joining the night that ends with the dawn of Sunday and Sunday itself, and you have the full number of days predicted by the Lord. For it was the last night, when the darkness still covered the earth and the day was just beginning to dawn, that the Savior rose between light and darkness, so that the night was counted as the day and so the prediction that he had done was done in his integrity.

appear the author of so great a crime, of so enormous sacrilege, but of the night; the day against the natural order of things is submitted to the preceding night, just as the God and Lord of all things is subject to the prince of death, in order to deliver all men from the chains of death. If anyone were tempted to see here again some contradiction, which he considers to moderate his appreciation, that God in putting on the form, I will not say of the man, but of the servant, has voluntarily surrendered to the death. Why, then, demand that order be followed, the place where you see in all things this reversed order? For what is this light that has him in the darkness, and that the darkness have not understood? (Jn. 1:5) It is the Lord of light who allowed us to seize his person. Now, whoever knows that he is seized by him to put him to death, counts from this moment the time of his death. That night follows the day he was judged and crucified. Then comes the night that ends on the Sabbath and the Sabbath itself. There is still the evening following the Sabbath. This is why Moses had given the Jews the figurative precept to begin the Sabbath day in the evening, in which the Lord is risen and who embraces the whole day of Sunday, for there is no night without day or day without night. With this explanation we understand that the resurrection of Our Lord took place after three days and three nights.

## MARK

(Mark 1:2; Malachi 3:1)

### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 57.** HOW CAN ST. MARK ATTRIBUTE TO THE PROPHET ISAIAH THOSE WORDS WHICH WE READ IN THE PROPHET MALACHI? "BEHOLD, I SEND MY ANGEL BEFORE YOUR FACE TO PREPARE THE WAY FOR YOU." — St. Mark could not ignore what he wrote, for it cannot be supposed that he had not read the prophets, he who from his childhood had learned the Holy Scriptures, and who was versed in the study of the law, as one of the faithful companions of the Apostles. Since he therefore knew that everything must be brought back to his author, he attributes this quotation to the one who first expressed it by saying: "Voice of one who cries in the desert, prepare the way of the Lord." So, after having quoted the words of Malachi, the evangelist immediately adds: "The voice of him who cries in the desert," so that the two testimonies which express the same thought may be united under the name of the first prophet.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
<p>(Mark 1:34)</p> <p><b>QUESTION 66.</b> HOW DID THE EVANGELIST ST. MARK SAY THAT THE DEMONS KNEW JESUS AND CONFESSED HIM PUBLICLY, WHILE THE APOSTLE DECLARES THAT THE PRINCES AND POWERS OF THIS WORLD HAVE NOT KNOWN THE DIVINITY OF THE LORD JESUS? (1 COR. 2:8) — Indeed, St. Mark says, "They knew it was him." The Apostle,</p>	<p>(Mark 1:34)</p> <p><b>QUESTION 48.</b> THE APOSTLE SAYS OF THE PRINCES AND POWERS OF THIS WORLD THAT IF THEY HAD KNOWN THE LORD OF GLORY, THEY WOULD NEVER HAVE CRUCIFIED HIM. (1 COR. 2:8) THE EVANGELIST ST. MARK, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS OF THE DEMONS: "THEY KNEW IT WAS HIM." IF THE DEMONS KNEW HIM, HOW</p>

on the contrary, assures us that none of the princes of this world knew him, for if they had known him, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory. (1 Cor. 2:8) If the demons knew him, how did the princes ignore him? Some think that by the princes of this world, we must understand the chief of the Jews, in the sense of these words of the apostle St. Peter: "You know, my brethren," he said to them, "that you have committed this crime by ignorance, as your leaders." (Acts 3:17) But these are the heads of the Jews, who were not princes of this world, and he said to their princes and not the princes of this world, since they declared that they had as king Caesar under the power of which they had been reduced. These princes are therefore those whom the Apostle said, "We have to fight, not against the flesh and the blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the princes of this world of darkness." (Eph. 6:12) The question has its reason for being. If these powers did not know Jesus, how could the demons know him? There is a big difference between what the demons knew in Christ, according to St. Mark, and what the princes of this world have ignored according to St. Paul. The demons knew that he was the Christ promised by the law, because they saw in him all the signs predicted by the prophets, as for example, that he would come out of the race of David, that he would be born of a virgin, and

COULD THE POWERS IGNORE HIM?" — Indeed, St. Mark says, "They knew it was him." The Apostle, on the contrary, assures us that none of the princes of this world knew him, for if they had known him, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory. (1 Cor. 2:8) If the demons knew him, how did the princes ignore him? Some think that by the princes of this world, we must understand the chief of the Jews, in the sense of these words of the apostle St. Peter: "You know, my brethren," he said to them, "that you have committed this crime by ignorance, as your leaders." (Acts 3:17) But these are the heads of the Jews, who were not princes of this world, and he said to their princes and not the princes of this world, since they declared that they had as king Caesar under the power of which they had been reduced. These princes are therefore those whom the Apostle said, "We have to fight, not against the flesh and the blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the princes of this world of darkness." (Eph. 6:12) The question has its reason for being. If these powers did not know Jesus, how could the demons know him? There is a big difference between what the demons knew in Christ, according to St. Mark, and what the princes of this world have ignored according to St. Paul. The demons knew that he was the Christ promised by the law, because they saw in him all the signs predicted by the

would be the Redeemer of Israel; but they did not know the mystery of his divinity as well as their princes. In fact, the devil is looking insincerely, it is true, of the Savior who is: "If you are the Son of God, etc." He saw in him sometimes signs of divine power, sometimes marks of human weakness, and doubt he entertained of this mixture was for him a torment. The Scriptures are therefore perfectly in agreement with the points that have been revealed. It is impossible, indeed, to suppose any contradiction between men inspired by the same spirit. Some think that by the princes and powers of this world, we must hear the first and the leaders of the Jews who, according to the apostle Peter, have ignored the greatness of the evil they had committed: "I know, my brothers, that you have committed this crime out of ignorance, like your leaders." These are the princes or chiefs of the Jews, who could not be called the princes of this world, since they were reduced under the power of the Romans, and they declared that they had no other king than Caesar. These princes of the world are therefore those whom the Apostle said in another place: "We have to fight not against flesh and blood, but against the princes of this world of darkness." If, then, these princes crucified Jesus Christ because they did not know that he was the Lord of glory, how could the demons have known? The knowledge of demons must not have been different from the

prophets, as for example, that he would come out of the race of David, that he would be born of a virgin, and would be the Redeemer of Israel; but they did not know the mystery of his divinity as well as their princes. In fact, the devil is looking insincerely, it is true, of the Savior who is: "If you are the Son of God, etc." He saw in him sometimes signs of divine power, sometimes marks of human weakness, and doubt he entertained of this mixture was for him a torment. The Scriptures are therefore perfectly in agreement with the points that have been revealed. It is impossible, indeed, to suppose any contradiction between men inspired by the same spirit. Some think that by the princes and powers of this world, we must hear the first and the leaders of the Jews who, according to the apostle Peter, have ignored the greatness of the evil they had committed: "I know, my brothers, that you have committed this crime out of ignorance, like your leaders." These are the princes or chiefs of the Jews, who could not be called the princes of this world, since they were reduced under the power of the Romans, and they declared that they had no other king than Caesar. These princes of the world are therefore those whom the Apostle said in another place: "We have to fight not against flesh and blood, but against the princes of this world of darkness." If, then, these princes crucified Jesus Christ because they did not know that he was the Lord

<p>knowledge of the princes of this world. They knew then that he was the one who had been promised in the law by the prophetic oracles, but they knew neither the mystery of his divine and eternal affiliation, nor the mystery of his Incarnation.</p>	<p>of glory, how could the demons have known? The knowledge of demons must not have been different from the knowledge of the princes of this world. They knew then that he was the one who had been promised in the law by the prophetic oracles, but they knew neither the mystery of his divine and eternal affiliation, nor the mystery of his Incarnation.</p>
---	--

(Mark 3:17)

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 24.** WHY DID THE SAVIOR CALL HIS DISCIPLES THE SONS OF THUNDER, WHO WERE RATHER THE SONS OF GOD, FOR THUNDER IS PRODUCED BY THE CLASH OF CLOUDS BETWEEN THEM? — As the thunder prints fear, Our Lord has wanted to give his disciples the name of sons of thunder, that is to say sons of the one to be dreaded; for although thunder is produced by the clash of clouds between them, yet the primary cause is the will of God, and that is why it inspires terror.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
<p><b>(Mark 7:24)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 77.</b> WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF ST. MARK THE EVANGELIST MEAN ABOUT OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST: "HAVING ENTERED A HOUSE, HE DESIRED THAT NO ONE SHOULD KNOW IT, BUT HE COULD NOT REMAIN HIDDEN?" WANTED TO REMAIN</p>	<p><b>(Mark 7:24)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 25.</b> HOW TO EXPLAIN THE STORY OF THE EVANGELIST ST. MARK, ACCORDING TO WHICH THE WILL OF CHRIST COULD NOT BE FULFILLED: "ON ENTERING THE HOUSE, HE WANTED NO ONE TO KNOW IT, BUT HE COULD NOT</p>

HIDDEN AND THAT HE COULD NOT; WAS HIS WILL MADE POWERLESS?— It is impossible that the will of the Savior will not have its effect, and he can only want what must be done, we must admit that he wanted everything that was done because his will never go beyond the power of his nature. This is therefore irreproachable as its nature. The fact referred to was over the confines of Tyre; Jesus entered a house and he did not want anyone to know it. Now, one asks how and for what reason he wished that one did not know his arrival. Note that this fact has its place on the confines of Gentiles, to whom the Gospel was not yet to be preached. When he gave his mission to his disciples, he said to them, "Go not to the nations, neither enter the cities of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. (Matt. 10:5) So he would not let anyone know that he was in that house, he did not want to be sought, but he gladly welcomed those who came forward; for although the time of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles had not yet come, yet there would have been something bad not to receive those who came spontaneously to embrace the faith. Thus it was not the disciples who knew the coming of the Savior, but those who saw him enter the house, who spread the news of his coming. It was thus known that he was in this house, and all who wished to obtain any benefit entered it. Our Lord, therefore, did not wish his disciples to

REMAIN HIDDEN!" IF HE WANTED TO REMAIN HIDDEN WITHOUT SUCCESS, HIS WILL WAS FOUGHT AND ANNULLED? — This fact, which is presented in a very abbreviated way, as if to make its meaning more hidden, has passed over the confines of Tyre. The Lord having thus arrived on the confines of Tyre entered a house. As the time had not yet come to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, he forbade anyone to let him know his arrival, that is to say, he did not want anyone to know it. It must be understood that he did not wish his disciples to teach him that he was in this house, he did not wish to be sought, because the time had not come to offer grace to the Gentiles. Now this woman came, and having heard that Jesus was there by those who had seen him come into this house, begged him to cast out the devil from his daughter's body. But the Savior, who knew that the time had not yet come to give grace to the Gentiles, replied: "Let the children be satisfied first, for it is not permitted to take the children's bread and give it to the dogs. (Matt. 15:26.) This woman surrendered to the Savior's response and obtained the benefit she desired. By this acquiescence in the words of Jesus, she professed to unite with the God of the Jews. This is the reason why he would not let anyone know from his disciples that he was in this house, and the thing took place as he pleased.

know that he was in this house, but he wanted to be sought after, and that was indeed the case; for he could not remain hidden once it was known that he had entered this house. Thus, as soon as the Chananean had heard of his arrival, she hastened to come to him and beg him to cast the demon out of her daughter's body (Matt. 15:22), and she certainly would not have obtained this grace if it had not previously been submitted by faith to the God of the Jews. The will of the Savior has been accomplished according to the explanation we have just given, and the discussion has us find what the short story of the Evangelist kept hidden.

## LUKE

(**Luke 1:27**)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 86.** WHAT IS THE PROOF THAT MARY, MOTHER OF THE LORD, WAS OF THE TRIBE AND RACE OF DAVID? — Let's quote the words of a genuine witness. It is the angel himself who says to Mary: "The Lord God will give him the name of David his father, and he will reign over the house of Jacob forever." How could such a truthful witness give David as father to Jesus Christ, if his mother was not of David's own race?

(**Luke 1:33**)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 26.** WE READ IN THE GOSPEL THAT THE ANGEL PREDICTED TO MARY, MOTHER OF THE LORD, THAT THE REIGN OF CHRIST WOULD "HAVE NO END." DANIEL MAKES THE SAME PREDICTION: "THEN WILL ARISE AN ETERNAL KINGDOM THAT WILL NEVER BE DESTROYED." ON THE CONTRARY, THE APOSTLE SPEAKING OF THE LORD SAYS: "WHEN HE HAS GIVEN HIS KINGDOM TO GOD HIS FATHER" (1 CORINTHIANS 15); HOW WILL HIS KINGDOM BE ETERNAL, SINCE HE MUST GIVE IT TO GOD HIS FATHER? — In so saying, the Son does not lose the kingdom by giving it to his Father, and so these words of the Apostle are true, without the angel and Daniel being in contradiction with them. Whoever thinks it their duty to call in question their testimony would bring unbelief to an excess. But we, whose faith cannot be shaken, see how it is to be understood that the Son hands the kingdom over to his Father, which the Apostle in another place explains in these terms: "Then the Son Himself will be subject to him who has subjected all things to Him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor.15) This submission is the very act of surrender of the kingdom, so here is the

interpretation that it is necessary to admit, not to deny that the Son is subject to his Father, and yet to recognize that his kingdom is eternal, that is to say, the kingdom of the Son, for in the name of Jesus every knee shakes in heaven, on the earth, and in hell. (Philip. 2) The Apostle St. Peter confirms this truth when he says: "No other name under heaven was given to men by which we were to be saved." (Acts 4) And did not the Lord Himself say to His disciples, "Until now you have not asked anything in my name, ask and I will answer you?" (Jn. 16) The reign of the Son therefore consists in the fact that it is in his name that all men are saved, and that all the prayers addressed to him until the end of the world are answered. But when all creatures have confessed Jesus Christ willingly or by force, and have been subjected to the power against which they have resisted, then the mystery of one God will be revealed to all men, and all thanksgivings will go back to God the Father, the principle of all things, that all preaching cease, one God be recognized in the mystery of the Trinity. Indeed, when all the powers, all the principalities and the dominions will have bowed their knee before Jesus Christ, then the Son will reveal that it is not the first principle from which all things come, but his Son in whom we see the Father. This is how he submits and gives the kingdom to his Father. In revealing that his Father is the first principle of all things, he submits to him by declaring that he comes from him. Indeed, the advent of the Son of God is surrounded by so much majesty and splendor that all the powers and choirs of the angels could believe that he is the only God par excellence. Now, the Savior declaring that he is not the one who is called the Father, but his Son, while continuing to reign, hands the kingdom over to his Father. Here we see both submission and surrender of the kingdom, for when he declares that he comes from the Father, he declares by the same that all that he has also comes from the Father, bringing everything back to him.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT  (Luke 1:34)	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT  (Luke 1:34)
<b>QUESTION 51. HOW MUST WE HEAR THE ANSWER GIVEN BY THE ANGEL GABRIEL TO THESE WORDS OF MARY: "HOW SHALL</b>	<b>QUESTION 38. HOW TO EXPLAIN THE QUESTION OF MARY TO THE ANGEL: "HOW SHALL I KNOW WHAT YOU SAY TO ME,</b>

I KNOW WHAT YOU SAY TO ME,  
FOR I KNOW NO MAN? AND THE  
ANGEL GABRIEL ANSWERING  
SAID TO HIM, "THE HOLY GHOST  
WILL COME UPON YOU, AND  
THE VIRTUE OF THE MOST HIGH  
WILL OVERSHADOW YOU?" —  
To the doubt that Mary expresses on  
the conception which is announced to  
her, the angel responds by teaching her  
how it will be accomplished. "The  
Holy Spirit will come unto you," that  
is to say, Have no doubt, because you  
know no man. I said to you: You will  
conceive, it is the Holy Spirit who will  
arise in you, who will operate this  
conception, without the intermediary  
of a man. "And the virtue of the Most  
High will overshadow you." The  
virtue of the Most High is  
unquestionably Jesus Christ, for it is  
one of the attributes of his person. The  
Holy Spirit, coming unto the Virgin  
Mary, sanctified her by her action by  
forming of her body a pure and holy  
body in which the virtue called the Son  
of God could be born. This virtue was  
to cover her with her shadow, that is to  
say, that something of the divine  
immensity was to spread in the bosom  
of the Virgin, and the brilliance of this  
majesty caused the angel to say that  
virtue God, who is none other than  
God himself, will cover her with his  
shadow. Indeed, nothing comes out of  
the divine substance that is to be called  
God. It is one of the characters of the  
external and sensible things that it is  
found in the flesh of the parts to which

FOR I KNOW NO MAN? AND THE  
ANGEL GABRIEL ANSWERING  
SAID TO HIM, "THE HOLY GHOST  
WILL COME UPON YOU, AND  
THE VIRTUE OF THE MOST HIGH  
WILL OVERSHADOW YOU?" —  
To the doubt that Mary expresses on  
the conception which is announced to  
her, the angel responds by teaching her  
how it will be accomplished. "The  
Holy Spirit will come unto you," that  
is to say, Have no doubt, because you  
know no man. I said to you: You will  
conceive, it is the Holy Spirit who will  
arise in you, who will operate this  
conception, without the intermediary  
of a man. "And the virtue of the Most  
High will overshadow you." The  
virtue of the Most High is  
unquestionably Jesus Christ, for it is  
one of the attributes of his person. The  
Holy Spirit, coming unto the Virgin  
Mary, sanctified her by her action by  
forming of her body a pure and holy  
body in which the virtue called the Son  
of God could be born. This virtue was  
to cover her with her shadow, that is to  
say, that something of the divine  
immensity was to spread in the bosom  
of the Virgin, and the brilliance of this  
majesty caused the angel to say that  
virtue God, who is none other than  
God himself, will cover her with his  
shadow. Indeed, nothing comes out of  
the divine substance that is to be called  
God. It is one of the characters of the  
external and sensible things that it is  
found in the flesh of the parts to which  
we cannot give the name of flesh, as

we cannot give the name of flesh, as the hairs, the bones, the nerves, etc. To doubt that Mary expresses, etc. The virtue of the Most High is unquestionably Christ; for this denomination is one of the distinctive characters of the Son of God who is called the virtue of God. If we consider the divinity, the Father is also the virtue, the Holy Spirit is also, and these three persons have one and the same virtue, because they have one and the same nature. The Holy Spirit therefore formed the body in the Virgin the flesh of the Savior, and the virtue of the Most High, that is, Christ, covered him with his shadow by coming into this flesh formed by the Holy Spirit, so that this virtue was hidden both in the body and in the soul. But to remain hidden for the virtue of the Most High is not to be understood for a time. Let's look more closely at the full meaning of this expression: "He will cover her with his shadow. To express the strength it contains, we will say that when the virtue of the Most High covers its shadow, the body which it covers in this way seems to be a part of the virtue of God. This operation forms a complete whole, because divinity cannot suffer from sharing. So the angel adds: "Therefore the holy one who is born of you will be called the Son of God." For what is born of the Holy Spirit, which the virtue of God, who is the Son of God, has covered with his shadow, in a word the body of

the hairs, the bones, the nerves, etc. To doubt that Mary expresses, etc. The virtue of the Most High is unquestionably Christ; for this denomination is one of the distinctive characters of the Son of God who is called the virtue of God. If we consider the divinity, the Father is also the virtue, the Holy Spirit is also, and these three persons have one and the same virtue, because they have one and the same nature. The Holy Spirit therefore formed the body in the Virgin the flesh of the Savior, and the virtue of the Most High, that is, Christ, covered him with his shadow by coming into this flesh formed by the Holy Spirit, so that this virtue was hidden both in the body and in the soul. But to remain hidden for the virtue of the Most High is not to be understood for a time. Let's look more closely at the full meaning of this expression: "He will cover her with his shadow. To express the strength it contains, we will say that when the virtue of the Most High covers its shadow, the body which it covers in this way seems to be a part of the virtue of God. This operation forms a complete whole, because divinity cannot suffer from sharing. So the angel adds: "Therefore the holy one who is born of you will be called the Son of God." For what is born of the Holy Spirit, which the virtue of God, who is the Son of God, has covered with his shadow, in a word the body of the Son of God is born holy, it cannot

<p>the Son of God is born holy, it cannot be denied. The body of one who is holy necessarily participates in his holiness. The Son of God, even holiness, is born in a holy body; for David, speaking of the flesh of Jesus Christ, said, "Thou shalt not allow thy saint to see corruption," and it is the very thing which he had in view as a pure and undefiled body.</p>	<p>be denied. The body of one who is holy necessarily participates in his holiness. The Son of God, even holiness, is born in a holy body; for David, speaking of the flesh of Jesus Christ, said, "Thou shalt not allow thy saint to see corruption," and it is the very thing which he had in view as a pure and undefiled body.</p>
---	--

### (Luke 2:34)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 73. WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF SIMEON MEAN TO MARY, MOTHER OF OUR LORD: "THIS IS ESTABLISHED FOR THE RUIN AND FOR THE RESURRECTION OF MANY IN ISRAEL.... AND THE SWORD WILL PIERCE YOUR SOUL SO THAT THE THOUGHTS HIDDEN IN THE BOTTOM HEARTS OF MANY ARE REVEALED?"** — Simeon, that holy personage, of whom the divine Scriptures praise, reveals by divine inspiration what Jesus Christ will be for men, a principle of fall and ruin for those who look at each other, as unshakeable in the observance and knowledge of the law, but who do not believe in the works of Jesus Christ, and have no part in the promises made to their fathers; a principle of resurrection for those who did not enjoy any kind of consideration in the law, but who believed in Jesus Christ, that is to say that God made worthy of him those who were regarded as unworthy and useless and that he reproved those who seemed great in the world. It is this same truth that Our Lord expresses in another place: "I have come into this world for judgment, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind. (John 9:39) And in fact, it is not the teachers of the law, nor the Pharisees, nor the scribes who have followed Jesus Christ, but ignorant and uneducated sinners. This is what

made the Savior says: "My Father, I give you thanks, because you have hid these things from the wise and the prudent, and have revealed them to the little ones." (Matt. 11:25) As for what Simeon adds: "And the sword will pierce your soul, so that the thoughts hidden in the depths of the hearts of many will be revealed," (Luke 2: 35) indicates that Mary, in whose bosom the mystery of the incarnation has been wrought, and there has been some doubt at the death of Our Lord, but doubts that the resurrection's brilliancy and the Savior's power soon changed into a firm and unshakable faith. At the death of the Savior, all under an impression of dread, let doubt enter their souls. However, they did not persevere in doubt. The sword only crosses the soul if doubt does not remain in thought; but he emerges from it by the force of the soul, which regains its rights. Who would not have been able to doubt, seeing the one who called himself the Son of God humiliated to death? But as I said, the resurrection of the Savior was to remove all doubt; that is why it is said that the sword will pass and not that it will fall on the heart, or that it will reach some member in passing. A line which is thrown and passes near a man may erase it, but without hurting it; so doubt was to produce sadness, but not until death, because it did not remain in the soul and it simply went through it, touching the hearts of the disciples like a shadow. See Cleophas and this other disciple who went to Emmaus; they were sad in the way, and told the Savior himself that they did not know him again: "We thought he was the one to deliver Israel." They doubted then, but scarcely had they recognized the Lord that this doubt vanished. It is also said of Joseph that "iron shook his soul." (Ps 104:18) For a long time held in chains despite his innocence, it is not surprising that he could have doubted God's righteousness towards him, but as his hope in God was stronger, he could not persevere in doubt. Everyone is judged on the vice for which he has the most inclination. The Apocalypse of St. John confirms this truth, "Those who doubt," he said, "and the unbelievers will have their share in the lake burning with fire and brimstone." (Rev. 21:8) He who therefore does not persevere in doubt is delivered from death, that is to say, he escapes death, for doubt about God or about Jesus Christ is a true death. He who ceases to doubt ceases to be subject to death.

**(Luke 14:33)**

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 27.** THE SAVIOR SAYS, "IF ANYONE DOES NOT LEAVE ALL THAT HE HAS, THAT IS, HIS HOUSE, HIS FIELDS, AND THE REST, HE CANNOT BE MY DISCIPLE." NOW, EVANGELIST SAYS IN ANOTHER PLACE, "HERE IS A SENATOR NAMED JOSEPH, A RICH MAN, WHO WAS A DISCIPLE OF JESUS AND WAS WAITING FOR THE KINGDOM OF GOD, APPROACHED PILATE, ETC." (MARK 15, LUKE 23) HOW DOES THE EVANGELIST PRESENT AS A DISCIPLE THE ONE WHOM THE SAVIOR REJECTS? BESIDES, ZACCHAEUS WAS ALSO RICH, AS WELL AS CORNELIUS THE CENTURION, AND THE WOMEN WHO ASSISTED HIM WITH THEIR PROPERTY. — The Apostle resolves this difficulty in this few words: "Let those who have the goods of this world be as if they did not have them, those who use things of this world as if they did not use them, and those who buy as if they did not possess." (1 Cor. 7:30) So whoever has the goods of the earth as if he did not have them, actually seems to have abandoned them. He does not seek to avail himself of them, nor to glorify them: his whole exterior is as humble and modest as his soul, he understands that he is only the steward and the dispenser of his goods; is it not leaving all that we have? for we leave what we no longer desire, and which ceases to be agreeable.

**(Luke 16:16)**

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 29.** IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS LASTED UNTIL JOHN THE BAPTIST, FROM WHOM THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN WAS PREACHED, FOR IT WAS HE WHO INAUGURATED THIS NEW PREACHING, WHY DID HIS BAPTISM CEASE? — The baptism of John, once instituted, has not ceased to be given; it only added what was missing. In fact, John only baptized, but did not give the Holy Spirit to those who believed, as he says of the Savior, "For me, I baptize you in water for penitence, but he will baptize you

in the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 3, Mark 1, Luke 3) That is, it is through my baptism that the forgiveness of sins is granted, but not the Holy Spirit who gives to those who have been purified the name and the rights of children of God; for it was a prerogative reserved for the Savior, as for the Lord God, that men should not become children of God until the Son of God gave them the Holy Spirit. The effect tacitly produced by John's baptism without any question concerning the Savior, although his name was pronounced, received all his strength from the Trinity. This is what the Savior's goodness teaches us by establishing the consecrated formula of the three names which from the beginning contributed to the same works under the name and person of one God. The name of the three divine persons came therefore to join the baptism of John with the expression of the mystery for so long hidden. God still communicates to this baptism a much more precious grace, it is that those who were baptized became children of God by receiving the Holy Spirit. This baptism was thus enriched with new graces, but was not suppressed.

**(Luke 21:25; 23:45)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 105. HOW TO RECONCILE THE PROPHECIES WITH THE GOSPEL ON THE OBSCURATION OF THE SUN AND ON SOME OTHER POINTS?** — The prophets predicted that at the first advent of the Lord, the sun would be darkened in the time of his passion, at the very time when, according to the Evangelists, the fact occurred, that is to say at noon. This is what the prophet Amos says: "In that day, says the Lord, the sun will disappear at midday, and the earth will be covered with darkness in the midst of the light." (Amos 8:9) The sun was thus darkened that day until the ninth hour, and the prophet's prediction was fulfilled. God wanted to give in the Savior's passion an image of what should happen at his second coming, because when he comes to judge the world, the stars will cease to give their accustomed light, according to these words of the Lord himself: "In those days the sun will be darkened and the moon will not shed its light." (Matt. 24:29) The prophet Joel also predicted this phenomenon so that one cannot doubt the fulfillment of a fact attested by several witnesses. "And the sun," he says, "will be changed into darkness and the moon into blood before the great

and terrible day of the Lord's coming." (Joel 2:31) As far as the literal meaning of these words indicates, they seem to be more fitting for the second advent, for then the Lord will manifest himself publicly to all men, to the testimony of Scripture: "Then every eye will see him, and all the tribes of the earth and those who have crucified him will strike their breast." (Rev. 1:7) Now, if according to the oracles of the prophets the sun is to be covered with darkness in the two events of the Lord, what is the day when, according to the prophet Isaiah, the sun and the moon must shine with greater brilliance?" The highest mountains, the highest hills will be sprinkled with streams of running water after the days of carnage, after the fall of the towers. The light of the moon will shine like the light of the sun, and the light of the sun will be seven times brighter in the day when the Lord will close the plague of his people and heal their wounds, etc." (Isa. 30:25-26) What is this day when the Lord promised to close the plague of his people? I think that this is the day that Zachariah, father of John the Baptist, sang: "Blessed is the Lord God of Israel, because he has visited us, and has delivered his people, and has raised the sign of salvation in the house of David his servant, as he promised through the mouth of his holy prophets, who were in the beginning, to save us from our enemies and from the hand of all who lower us to fulfill His mercies towards our fathers." (Luke 1:68, etc.) Simeon also said, "This is established for the ruin and for the resurrection of many in Israel." (Luke 2:34) He wants to talk about the ruin of the Scribes, the Pharisees and the main Jews who are represented by the towers in the prophet's prediction. And while their unbelief was the cause of their ruin, others arose by the faith that negligence retained powerlessness and infirmity. That is why the Savior said: "I have come to this world for judgment, that those who do not see shall see, and those who see, blind; (Jn. 9:39) That is to say, those whom their knowledge and skill in the law made shine like lights became blind and the eyes of the blind, that is to say ignorant and publicans, open to the light by faith. So the prophet foretold that the Savior would take care of their infirmities, and this prophecy is fulfilled in his time, as we see in the Gospel: "He really has borne our torpor, of our sufferings." (Isa. 1:4) All these predictions have received their consummation and fulfillment in the Savior's passion, and thus the salvation of the human race has been done in a true way for those who were on earth or in hell, for the prophecy of Zachariah embraces both of them at once. On earth, men have been freed from the oppression of their enemies by the intervention of the mercy

of God, and in hell they were delivered from the sorrows they endured. Indeed, all those who hoped in Christ who had been promised to them awaited the coming of him who was to triumph over death and deliver them from hell. This is why Zechariah says: "To fulfill his mercies toward our fathers." (Luke 1:72) But if it is understood that this salvation must also come in the second advent, but it is especially in the second that the sun will be covered with darkness and the moon will not give its light, how to admit that the light of the sun and the moon will shine more brightly in the day when God will visit his people, since, in one as in the other time when the deliverance of this people begins and ends, we read that not only the light of the sun and the moon will be weakened, but that these stars will be completely obscured. We must therefore understand that the sun and the moon represent the saints here, just as in another place they are compared to the stars of heaven, to the testimony of the Apostle St. Paul, who declares that the saints shine in this world like the stars of the faith. We also read in the Gospel that the righteous will shine like the sun (Matt. 13:43), because the Lord compares good works to light. "May your light," he says, "shine before men, so that when you see your good works they will glorify your Father, who is in heaven." (Matt. 5:16) Therefore those who have abandoned all their goods to follow the Lord, owe to their justice and holiness, to be compared to the sun and the moon seven times brighter. "There is no one," says the Savior, "who has left either his house, or his wife, or his children, or his fields, which has received seven times as much in this world." (Luke 18:29) Now those who receive here seven times as much honor will be in the other life seven times brighter than the rest, that is, their resurrection will be like the sun and the moon and the resurrection of others like the stars. The glory of the saints who receives here seven times of brilliance, will receive seven times more in the resurrection, that is to say, that he who has here below the brightness of the moon will receive in the other life the brightness of the sun, and the one here below as bright as the sun will shine seven times brighter in the other life. The prophet Isaiah therefore rightly uses the comparison of the sun and the moon to predict the increase of the glory of the saints. If indeed our Lord is called the sun of righteousness, and the saints must be like him, to the testimony of the apostle St. John: "When he appears, we shall be like him." (1 Jn. 3:2) The prophet is right in comparing the saints with the sun, but pointing out that the brightness of the sun is seven times greater than that of the moon. When he predicts that the light of the

moon will have the same brightness as that of the sun, but that the sunlight will be seven times brighter, he wants us to understand that the light of the moon will become seven times brighter to match that of the sun, that is, the moon will be as bright as the sun is now. Although the application of this comparison of the stars to the saints is in the opposite direction, yet it brings out in part the increase of their glory, that is to say, after the increase of the light of the sun and the moon, and the distance that will exist between one saint and another after they have received their reward will be as great as that which separates them in the present life.

### (Luke 22)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 84. WHY DO WE, WHO ARE KEEPING THE PASSOVER FEAST BY THE PHASE OF THE MOON, REPROACH THE PAGANS FOR OBSERVING THE DAYS AND THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF THE MOON?**

— Far from Christians the reproach of worshiping the stars, who have received from God a spiritual worship which teaches them to despise the things that appear, to unite with the invisible and celestial things, and to rise above all created objects to heaven, where they must be eternally with the angels of God. As for the worshipers of the stars, they will be with them or even under them; for how to place a man above what has been the object of his adoration? It is not therefore the course of the moon that the pagans observe, it is the moon itself, which they adore as a divinity. They imagine that they have discovered the influence of its different phases, and they decide accordingly what they will have to do or omit on certain days, by categorically submitting their conduct and all their life to its realm. Now, it is a recklessness in direct opposition to the order of God and which makes them fall, as we see, into frequent errors. God has established the stars to determine the times. We therefore observe the number of days of the moon, but we do not worship it, and we specify the time of the Passover on the fourteenth day of the moon, which is the first according to here. All things that God has done have a character of fullness; We are therefore permitted to celebrate the Passover for seven days, from the fourteenth day of the moon until the twenty-first, so as to contain in this space seven days from the preparation of the Passover until the

resurrection of the Savior, avoiding that the passion falls on the thirteenth day, or the resurrection the fourteenth or the fifteenth, so that passion may not be celebrated before the first moon in our day, nor resurrection on another day than the day when the world was created. In fact, all the times that regulate the course of the world are included in the space of a single week, because it is in the space of seven days that God has given to the world the form and brightness that we admire it. He created the world in six days and stopped creating the seventh day, which we call Sabbath. These seven days include all the reason and the different numbers of the world. By continually returning to themselves, they give rise to the multiplication of times. After the Sabbath, the week begins again from the first day until the seventh, that is to say until the Sabbath, to teach us that the resurrection of the Lord was made the first day of the creation of the world, that we call the day of the Lord. God did it together with the evening, and after a seven-day revolution, he comes back again to be the first day of a new week. Things were thus regulated from the beginning in view of the mysteries of the incarnation of the Lord, of his passion and resurrection; for the resurrection of the body of the Lord was the resurrection, the repair of the world almost entirely. It is therefore well established that we do not worship the moon, but we observe the number of days that are marked by the course of the moon. The devil, therefore, who is the same as Satan, to give some authority to his deceptions and to put his lies in the colors of the truth, in the first month that he knows that we must celebrate the mysteries of the Lord, uses his power, which is great, to establish among the pagans mysteries which he also commands them to celebrate. he thus holds their minds in error for two reasons. As his lies precede the truth, he thus gives them superiority over her, and he makes this antiquity a prejudgment unfavorable to the truth. Secondly; as it is in the first month when the Romans place, like us, the equinox, that the pagans celebrate these sacrifices and affirm that the atonement is made by blood, as we say it is made by the cross; the devil, by this ploy, restrains them in error, persuades them that our truth is only an imitation of the truth and a superstition which we have invented in a spirit of rivalry. For, they say, one cannot look upon what is later invention as true. But miracles and wonders testify that we are certainly in possession of the truth, and the brilliance of these miracles sets us in all its glory. Since this proof is indeed the only one that easily convinces, God has opposed it to the ploys and tricks of the devil to reveal his lies. Who could, even if it were an

enemy of the Christian religion, deny that the truth is where the divine power is revealed in all its strength?

**(Luke 22:50)**

**1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 104. ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.** — Our Lord, foreseeing the war that the Jews were going to declare on him, recommends to his disciples to arm themselves with swords. They obeyed this order, and when this impious war began under the leadership of Judas Iscariot, Peter, seeing the enemies ready to throw himself on his master, drew his sword and cut off the ear of the high priest's servant. This order, and when this impious war begins under the leadership of Judas Iscariot, Peter, seeing the enemies ready to throw himself on his master, draws his sword and cuts off the ear of the high priest's servant. (Luke 22:50) Then the Lord commanded Peter to put his sword in his sheath, "For all those," he says, "who use the sword will perish by the sword.: (Matt. 26:52) Why does he command to prepare swords since he forbids using them and even threatens to kill anyone who has struck with the sword? The Apostle, however, seems to have acted in all justice, for he has struck the man whom he saw armed against him. It was a duty for him to resist ungrateful servants who were armed to put the Savior to death. If you examine every circumstance of this fact, of which you ask the explanation, you will find other questions. What, indeed, was it that the one who had for support a very spiritual force should make his disciples prepare material weapons, and that after forbidding them to carry in their journey neither purse, nor money, nor baton he now revokes his defense? Let us begin by explaining why Our Lord commands his disciples to arm themselves with swords and forbids them to use them. It was not only against his enemies, but in the interests of his disciples themselves that he commanded them to obtain arms for the war that was about to break out. It must have been a new and surprising sight that the author of so many unusual and extraordinary prodigies suddenly fell into an excess of humiliations that subjected him to ill-treatment and death. Now, to show that these sufferings had not surprised him in the unforeseen, and as a man reduced to impotence, he predicted the advantages, thus showing that he had not the least doubt, but that he prepared to

support them knowingly. And as his humiliations were voluntary, he does not want to be opposed to his enemies violent resistance, and he makes it clear that he was still what he had always been, when in the hands of his enemies he heals the ear that Peter had cut off and attached to what the action of the sword had detached; and it is not as a bodily doctor, but as the Creator of the bodies that he recreates his work that the sword had disfigured; because doctors can never restore detached limbs from the body. Therefore, so that the power of God might be reduced to him, and as it had always been, and also to show the truth of these words that he had said, "I have the power to give my life, and I have the power to take it back," (Jn. 10:18) that he commands his disciples to obtain swords, but without commanding them to use them to kill his enemies. We now have to consider why the Savior, witness of Peter's action, declares that whoever uses the sword will perish by the sword (Matt. 26:52), whereas, however, Peter had not used it unjustly; for, as we read in St. Luke, it was with the permission of the Lord that he struck Malchus and then heard the defense that was made to him. (Luke 22:50) The Savior gave him this permission to show that he could have taken revenge on his enemies, to show that he had the same power which he had shown, and that he could therefore avenge himself, and in order to convince his enemies that they seized him by virtue of a power they had received. He did not appear as vanquished, but as a man who abandons himself to their will. Why then does he say that whoever uses the sword will perish by the sword? It is because the judge alone has the right to destroy by the sword; and Peter had the permission only to strike, but not to take away life by the sword. This is why Our Lord forbids him to strike again. He also tells him that Christians are not allowed to kill their fellow men. They are under a law of mercy, and they are forbidden to use with harshness the right which has been conferred on society. As for the recommendation that he previously made to them to carry nothing with them in the road (Matt. 10:10), it is like a sign of peace, of the grace of miracles, of the sweetness of a doctrine that will be seen in the Apostles. What did they need to take with them on the road, since they had to offer everything to them at the sight of the miracles they were operating? But when the time came when he was to voluntarily give himself up to suffering, and was on the eve of a passing struggle rather than a war properly so called, he advised his followers to arm themselves not to resist his enemies, since his will was to be pleased, but to show, as I have said, that he had foreseen his passion, that it was subordinated to

his power, and that if he consented to this excess of humiliation was for the salvation of the human race, as we will say in its place.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT
<b>(Luke 23:44)</b>  <b>QUESTION 67. HOW TO EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF THE SAVIOR ON THE CROSS: "MY FATHER, FORGIVE THEM, FOR THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY DO?" — If they do not know what they are doing, how can they be forgiven when King Abimelech said to God, "Will you lose an innocent nation because of its ignorance?" (Gen. 20:4) All ignorance is not free from punishment. Ignorance is excusable in those who have not been able to find the means of education. But the Savior asks his Father to forgive those who have no concern to learn when they can. This ignorance is therefore guilty of them, and it will be forgiven if they become converted. All ignorance is not free from punishment. He who could instruct himself and did not do it. Nothing no longer kept the teachers to learn, but pleasures or a bad disposition made them neglect this duty and rendered it completely inexcusable. This is what makes the Savior say by speaking of the Jews: "If I had not come, and if I had not spoken</b>	<b>(Luke 23:44)</b>  <b>QUESTION 4. WHY DID THE SAVIOR, ATTACHED TO THE CROSS, SAY, "FATHER, FORGIVE THEM, FOR THEY KNOW NOT WHAT THEY DO. IF THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING, WHAT NEED TO FORGIVE THEM, ESPECIALLY WHEN ABIMELECH SAYS TO GOD, "WILL YOU LOSE THOSE WHO HAVE SINNED THROUGH IGNORANCE? — If they do not know what they are doing, how can they be forgiven when King Abimelech said to God, "Will you lose an innocent nation because of its ignorance?" (Gen. 20:4) All ignorance is not free from punishment. Ignorance is excusable in those who have not been able to find the means of education. But the Savior asks his Father to forgive those who have no concern to learn when they can. This ignorance is therefore guilty of them, and it will be forgiven if they become converted. All ignorance is not free from punishment. He who could instruct himself and did not do it. Nothing no longer kept the teachers</b>

to them, they would have no sin." (Jn. 15:22) As for the one who is in ignorance without his fault, because he has not found a teacher to educate him and he could not know by the public what it was necessary to think of such a doctrine, he is made free from fault and conviction. The Lord asks his Father to forgive if they convert, to those who took no care to learn the truth when he announced it to them and who ignorantly killed the very author of the truth. This is why the Apostle St. Peter tells them in Acts, "Convert ye, that your sins may be blotted out. (Acts 3:19)

to learn, but pleasures or a bad disposition made them neglect this duty and rendered it completely inexcusable. This is what makes the Savior say by speaking of the Jews: "If I had not come, and if I had not spoken to them, they would have no sin." (Jn. 15:22) As for the one who is in ignorance without his fault, because he has not found a teacher to educate him and he could not know by the public what it was necessary to think of such a doctrine, he is made free from fault and conviction. The Lord asks his Father to forgive if they convert, to those who took no care to learn the truth when he announced it to them and who ignorantly killed the very author of the truth. This is why the Apostle St. Peter tells them in Acts, "Convert ye, that your sins may be blotted out. (Acts 3:19)

## JOHN

(John 1:1-3)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 122. THE PRINCIPLE OR THE BEGINNING.** — In the beginning was the Word. (Jn. 1:1) What is at the beginning? We read in the Old Testament: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth (Gen. 1:1)." And in the Epistle of the same Apostle (John), author of this Gospel, of which we try to explain the exordium, this expression is taken in the same sense. This is how it is expressed in this Epistle: "What was in the beginning (I Jn. 1:1)." The Epistle and the Gospel thus present the same thought, the same signification. On the contrary, there is a discrepancy between these words of the Old Testament: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," and those of the New Testament: "In the beginning was the Word." And again: "That which was from the beginning." Being in the beginning, and being from the beginning signifies one and the same thing, for what was from the beginning did not begin to be. What begins to exist was not from the beginning, and therefore is subject to a beginning to be first in the order of creatures, because in fact the one that was made in the beginning was followed by all those which were made after him. Here is why we read: 'In the beginning were heaven and earth', for while they did not yet extirpate and God had resolved to create the world; in principle, that is to say, among the elements which were to serve the creation of the world, God created heaven and earth first, because the principle is the beginning of a thing which begins to be the first of those to follow. But when the Evangelist says: "In the beginning was the Word," he wants to teach us that he existed before all the creatures of heaven and earth, and that he is not only the first of created beings, for it was in the beginning when God had resolved to create the world, and if it were in principle, that is, before all things, it existed from all eternity, he was the Word, and where was he? "In God," said the Evangelist, "that there should be no temptation to give him a beginning worthy of him who was in God from all eternity that the one who was in God before all things was not subject to any beginning, so the Evangelist adds, "And the Word was God." He clearly shows that everything he said before applies perfectly to the

Word, for the Word is God, and there can be no other thought worthy of God than that of his eternalness, if it began to be, it is a creature, and if it is created it is not God. All that exists is either God or creature, and by the same name the name of God does not fit the creature. But as his being has no beginning (for he was), it is rightly that we call him God. Now, we say that the Word has always been in God, because his being does not come from himself, but from God. This is why He is called the Word of God, as the testimony of the same Evangelist teaches in his revelation: "And his name is the Word of God (Rev. 19:13)." He is called the Word of God, to teach us that he is not that of whom, but by whom are all things; that is to say, he is not the Father, but the Son. By the same that God cannot be without his Word, we must believe that he who is called his Word has always been in God, and as the Word cannot be apart from the one of whom he is the Word, we must understand that Word who was in God had no other principle of his being than God himself, and that being of God he is not opposed to the reason of saying that he is God. Thus, from the fact that God was in God, it does not follow that there are two gods. If they were two, they would have a different nature and will. If we, who have one and the same nature, we do not consent to have different wills, how much more if God and the Word did not have the same nature, and if the Word was not God in God? The God who was and who is in God, does not have the divine being himself, otherwise we would not say that he is God in God, and the Word of God would not be called the Word God; but since what is of God can only be God, the Word of God is called God, so that this name of God's Word prevents us from thinking of another God. Now the Word is given the name of God, because it would be offensive to God that what is of God should not be called God. The unity of God has thus safeguarded, and at the same time the honor rendered to those of the law, for it is not in his own glory that he who is God from God is but in the glory of him who is the principle of his divine being. This is why the Gospel begins to speak about the Word before speaking of God the Father, because what raises difficulties is not God the Father, but the Word of God. No one raises doubts about God, but about the one who is God from God, every language on earth as in the underworld confesses the existence of one God, but he is troubled by the mystery of one God. He is astonished to hear that the Word of God is God, for he is besieged by the corporal images that tell him that the name of man cannot be given to the Word of Man. A simple nature is not a compound of different members, there is

not in and out of it, the front and the back, the high and the low, no variety, no dissemblance, it is a splendor which is one and immense, if the fire itself has neither front, nor behind nor inside, nor outside, how much less its Creator. Since therefore all that is God is a unique whole, there is no contradiction in calling God all that is God. So a reason borrowed in part from that occurs among men, and partly to a higher order of things, makes us understand that the Son of God who is the Word of God, is God; just as the children of men are men, so the Son of God is God. But the children of men are men because of the union of the two sexes, and it is not so that the Son of God is God, because he is not simply of a God who is a simple nature. Our word, which is from us, helps us to understand that the Word of God is from him, but our word is not what we are, and it is not in this way that the Word of God is God, because the Word of God is a real thing and not a sound that goes out. From the fact that we use the same expressions for God and for us, it does not follow that the reason for being is the same for us and for him in reality. Thus we read, "In the beginning God made heaven and earth." (Gen. 1:1) How did they do it? Is it with the hand, as when we do some action? Further down we read again: "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light." To whom do we hear that God has spoken here? This is certainly not a man, but one who had the power to create, and who was to create the man himself as he created it indeed. But how did he speak? Is it beginning with a material organ? Far from us this thought. You see, then, that if we use the same expressions for God and for us, these expressions indicate a very different way of acting, for God acts quite differently from us, and his language has nothing to do with ours. Thus the Word of God is not a Word like ours, which scarcely formed ceases to exist; it is a Word that remains, because it is a Word that hears, speaks, acts. He is not only the Word of God, he is the power, the wisdom of God, he is the Son of God. As to the effect produced, he is the Son of God; if we consider the manner in which God speaks to us through him, he is called the Word of God; if we look at the wisdom by which God teaches us through his mysteries, he is the wisdom of God; if finally we contemplate this omnipotent operation by virtue of which God has made and continues to do all things, it is called the power of God. None of these titles can be acceptable to the Son of God. By the same thing that he is God from God, we attribute to him all the perfections of the divine nature. These divine attributes are a necessary continuation of his birth. It would not have been fitting for the Word

of God, the wisdom, the power of God, to be anything inferior to God, for that is the God the Word, the power and wisdom of God. It is because Christ is the whole God from God himself, that he is called wisdom, power, the Word of God, because that is how he is God from God and God abiding in God. That's why the Evangelist says, "He was in God from the beginning." (Jn. 1:2) The Scripture is forced to make this statement to convince the spirits of unbelievers; it wants to show that Christ is God; as everywhere to consecrate the unity of God, it wants us to understand that Christ is God. Here Scripture openly proclaims that he is God and that he has always been good, that is to say, that he reveals to us the mystery that is in God, to teach us that he is not alone. Scripture therefore declares that if God is one, he is not however alone, but that even if there are two or three persons in him, they come out of the same nature and do not detract in any way from unity, because what comes from a single principle relates to it, because this principle is a good that all things come from God. But there is a great difference between what derives its being from God in a proper sense, and what he has created out of his will, that is to say, there is an immense distance between what is out of its substance, and what does not exist has been drawn from nothingness by its will. What came out of the substance of God did not exist after this substance; on the contrary, what was created began to be a substance only at the moment of its creation. There is only the Trinity alone, which has no beginning. The manifestation of this mystery has diminished the merit of faith, for the more the object of faith is hidden, the greater is the reward of him who believes, and for the same reason the greater the punishment of the unbeliever. Just as the manifestation of the mystery diminishes the merit of believers, it increases the punishment reserved for those who refuse to believe. The more a law is clear, the more one is guilty of transgressing it. No doubt it was enough of the testimony of the Savior who declared that he had God for his Father. Who among the faithful could have the slightest doubt that the nature of the Son was in any way different from that of the Father? But the perversity of heretics having sought to undermine the rights of faith by their impious and untrue fictions, hearing the Son of God in a different sense from what the Christian faith taught, the Evangelist thought it necessary to add for more great clarity that he had been before all things in God and God himself. This is how he explained what the notion of the true Son contains. Divine goodness seems to have had regard to human weakness by manifesting what had

previously remained hidden, and which it reserved as a reward for a more perfect faith. St. John adds: "All things were done by him." (Jn. 1:3) If the foregoing could leave some doubt in the human mind too narrow to understand the divine things, it grows, it seems, hearing these words: "All things were made by him." He cannot regard him as a creature, since he is told that God has done all things through him. Now, if he were himself a creature, the Evangelist would not say that God did all things, for it was not done by himself. To put this truth into a greater way, he adds; "And nothing was done without him," words that put an end to any discussion and exclude all human reasoning. There are some who may have doubts, yet the Evangelist, declaring that nothing has been done without him, does not even allow him to suspect that he himself is a creature. How to say that he is a creature made and designed from nothing, when you are taught that God did nothing without him? Do you say that Scripture says that God did nothing without him? Far from us this thought. Scripture is the very truth, and to cut error into its root, it spreads the brightest light to redeem men and save them. St. John adds, "What has been done is life in him," that is, what has been done is life in the Word. This is what the Lord himself teaches us: Just as the Father has life in him, so he gave the Son to have life in him. (Jn. 5:26) It is not that the Word was ever lifeless, and that it was given to him or made in him, the Evangelist wants us to understand that the Word was itself life. If one can say of the Father that he is something else or that he has something else in him, one can say it also of the Son, for just as the Father has life in him, he has given to the Son to have life in him. Human language is powerless to properly express divine things. Thus it seems improper to say that the Son of God having not been made, we say that what has been done in him. If the Evangelist had said: What was engendered in him, the property of the terms would leave something to be desired. But to express his substantial generation, he used the terms he could find to make known the work of this generation that gave it to be, because this generation has life in it. For us, we have life, it is true, but we cannot communicate it to others, because this very life is not in our power. But for the Word, the Evangelist says that he has life in him, because he has the power to give life, and to draw from the void the creatures he wants to give them existence and life. The end of his divine birth is that he can do all the things the Father does, because he has life in him like the Father. In fact, to have done all things through him and in him, is to have begotten him to have in him the life by which he could

do all things. It is not that he is himself anything but life, but since the essence of his life is to live, and to be able to communicate this life to the beings that he draws from nothingness, they say he has life in himself. We live, I repeat, but we do not have in us the life itself to be able to communicate it to others. It is this truth which the Apostle St. Paul recalls in these terms: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creatures? It is through him that everything was created in heaven and on earth, things visible as invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, everything was created by him and in him. (Col. 1:15) The two testimonies of the Apostles St. John and St. Paul are perfectly in agreement, they teach the same truth, that is, the Son of God was begotten before all creatures, for to create the spiritual powers, the world and all the visible beings that it contains. St. John says: "What was done is life in him," (Jn. 1:3) and St. Paul expresses the same truth in these words: "It is through him that everything was created in heaven and on the earth." (Col. 1:16) And further: "Everything was created by him and in him." God created through him, because he is the same God by nature, that is, the Father is in the Son. "Everything was created in him," because he begot the Son to have the power to create all things visible and invisible. This is how he made life in him, so that he might exist and give to all other animated beings life, intelligence, action, according to his will as the image of God. He is called the image of God for these two reasons, first, because by virtue of his birth he reproduces in himself the perfect likeness of the Father, and secondly because his power is equal to that of the Father, so that it is true to say that we see the Father in the Son who is the image of the invisible God. From what he declares the invisible Father, does it follow that the Son is visible? No, since the Son is by nature what the Father is. Since the celestial creature is invisible, let alone the one who created it. The Evangelist therefore wishes to speak here of what is being accomplished not on earth, but in heaven, for although the Son is invisible, yet he manifests himself in heaven and to the saints of whom he has said himself: "My Father, I want them wherever I am, to be with me, and to contemplate my glory." (Jn. 17:24) And elsewhere: "Blessed are those who have a pure heart, because they will see God," (Matt. 5:8), that is, the Father in the Son, God in his image, that is, God in God. The image of a corporeal object is itself bodily; thus God is the image of God, because the Father is the model, and the Son the reproduction of the copy, which he communicates to the Holy Spirit, "because he will receive from me," (Jn. 16:14), he says to his Apostles,

just as no one has been found worthy to open the book and lift the seals, except the Word of God (Rev. 5:4), so no one is worthy to see God the Father either by his nature or by his merits, except the true Son of God. There is no intermediary between the Father and the Son, it is Himself who declares it to us: "No one has ever seen the Father, except he who is of God, he has seen the Father." (Jn. 6:46) But if we see the Father in the Son, why is no one worthy to see God, since we see him in the Son who is no different from the Father? There is no difference in nature, we agree, because he is the real Son of God, but it differs in the relation of causality, because all power comes to the Son from the Father. The Son does not have a nature inferior to the Father, but the Father has greater authority in the testimony of the Lord himself: "If you love me," he said to his disciples, "If you love me," he said to his disciples, "you will rejoice at my going to my Father, because my Father is greater than me." (Jn. 14:28) Saint Paul observes the same nuance in his language when he says: "There is for us but one God, the Father from whom all things proceed and who has made us for him, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom all things were made, and we exist through him." (1 Cor. 8:6) In the first degree is that of whom are all things, by whom all things exist, and since there is no inferiority in the divine persons, the Apostle brings them all back to the unity of God when he says, "It is of him, and through him, and in him are all things, to him be glory in all ages." (Rom. 11:36)

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
<p><b>(John 1:17)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 76.</b> ST. JOHN SAYS IN HIS GOSPEL: "THE LAW WAS GIVEN BY MOSES; GRACE AND TRUTH CAME FROM JESUS CHRIST." SO GRACE AND TRUTH DID NOT EXIST BEFOREHAND. HOW, THEN, DID GOD GIVE A LAW THAT DID NOT CONTAIN THE TRUTH? — Let us not pass lightly on these words, but consider attentively what these words mean: "The law was given by Moses." The law given by Moses has clear precepts; but he has also written a story to which we have also given the name of law. Let us see then what in the precepts would not be true. Would it be these commandments: "You will not kill, you will not commit adultery, you will not steal?" (Exod. 20:13) The others are alike. As for the historical part, it is evident that it was not true before the advent of Jesus Christ; for one could not know the true meaning of those things which were covered like a veil. But when Jesus Christ came to make known to whom God speaks, saying, "Let us make man in our image and likeness," (Gen. 1:26) who created him, whoever created him, appeared to the patriarchs in a bush (Exod. 3:2), the one who made the stone fertile (Exod. 17:6) and poured out streams in the desert, for the stone, says the Apostle, was Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 10:4); it can be said that the truth shone</p>	<p><b>(John 1:17)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 30.</b> WE READ IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN: "THE LAW WAS GIVEN BY MOSES, GRACE AND TRUTH BY JESUS CHRIST." IF THEREFORE GRACE AND TRUTH CAME THROUGH JESUS CHRIST, THEN IT DID NOT EXIST BEFORE, AND IF SO, HOW CAN IT BE SAID THAT GOD GAVE A LAW THAT DID NOT CONTAIN THE TRUTH? — Let us not pass lightly on these words, but consider attentively what these words mean: "The law was given by Moses." The law given by Moses has clear precepts; but he has also written a story to which we have also given the name of law. Let us see then what in the precepts would not be true. Would it be these commandments: "You will not kill, you will not commit adultery, you will not steal?" (Exod. 20:13) The others are alike. As for the historical part, it is evident that it was not true before the advent of Jesus Christ; for one could not know the true meaning of those things which were covered like a veil. But when Jesus Christ came to make known to whom God speaks, saying, "Let us make man in our image and likeness," (Gen. 1:26) who created him, whoever created him, appeared to the patriarchs in a bush (Exod. 3:2), the one who made the stone fertile (Exod. 17:6) and poured out streams in the desert, for</p>

most brightly by Jesus Christ when he revealed the true meaning of things that had hitherto remained hidden or doubtful. Is it not he who says to us, "Is it from me that Moses wrote?" (Jn. 5:46) This is what before him was hidden and was wrong. The Son was considered to be God the Father, and it was recognized that it was the Son of God himself who appeared in the form of an angel. The promise that God made to Abraham remained doubtful until it was fulfilled; but when the coming of Jesus Christ came to fulfill the law, it became a truth, for it had all its faith and it was clear what its object was. Indeed one recognizes the truth of the one who makes a promise when he puts it into execution. Let us examine what these words mean: "The law was given by Moses." The law given by Moses has clear precepts, which of these precepts is not an exact truth? "You will not kill, you will not commit adultery"; The others are similar. But Moses also wrote in which, until the advent of the Savior, the truth remained covered like a veil. When Jesus Christ came to make known to whom God was speaking, saying, "Let us make man", who is the one who created the man, who showed himself in the bush or the patriarchs, who poured torrents of water from the rock; for "the stone was Christ," says St. Paul; the truth was made by Jesus Christ, who made known to us the true meaning of things that remained uncertain to us. The law given by

the stone, says the Apostle, was Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 10:4); it can be said that the truth shone most brightly by Jesus Christ when he revealed the true meaning of things that had hitherto remained hidden or doubtful. Is it not he who says to us, "Is it from me that Moses wrote?" (Jn. 5:46) This is what before him was hidden and was wrong. The Son was considered to be God the Father, and it was recognized that it was the Son of God himself who appeared in the form of an angel. The promise that God made to Abraham remained doubtful until it was fulfilled; but when the coming of Jesus Christ came to fulfill the law, it became a truth, for it had all its faith and it was clear what its object was. Indeed one recognizes the truth of the one who makes a promise when he puts it into execution. Let us examine what these words mean: "The law was given by Moses." The law given by Moses has clear precepts, which of these precepts is not an exact truth? "You will not kill, you will not commit adultery"; The others are similar. But Moses also wrote in which, until the advent of the Savior, the truth remained covered like a veil. When Jesus Christ came to make known to whom God was speaking, saying, "Let us make man", who is the one who created the man, who showed himself in the bush or the patriarchs, who poured torrents of water from the rock; for "the stone was Christ," says St. Paul; the truth was made by Jesus

Moses thus convinced sinners to be guilty; the grace promised by the law has given them their sins and delivered them from death. The order that God wished to follow was to first give the law, and then mercy, which becomes grace when it remits sins; for the promise changes into grace by its fulfillment. "There will come," says Isaiah, "a redeemer for Zion, who will deliver Jacob from his ungodliness." (Isa. 59:20 LXX) This promise became grace through Jesus Christ, who remits sin free of charge. Now, how would he forgive sins if he did not first give the law which, rendering men guilty, gives him an opportunity to forgive their sins? Because he could only put back what was due to him. However, this debt could not exist if the law had not preceded.

Christ, who made known to us the true meaning of things that remained uncertain to us. The law given by Moses thus convinced sinners to be guilty; the grace promised by the law has given them their sins and delivered them from death. The order that God wished to follow was to first give the law, and then mercy, which becomes grace when it remits sins; for the promise changes into grace by its fulfillment. "There will come," says Isaiah, "a redeemer for Zion, who will deliver Jacob from his ungodliness." (Isa. 59:20 LXX) This promise became grace through Jesus Christ, who remits sin free of charge. Now, how would he forgive sins if he did not first give the law which, rendering men guilty, gives him an opportunity to forgive their sins? Because he could only put back what was due to him. However, this debt could not exist if the law had not preceded.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(John 3:2)	(John 3:2)

**QUESTION 59.** IF BAPTISM IS A HEAVENLY MYSTERY, WHY DOES OUR LORD SAY TO NICODEMUS, WHO DOUBTED THE VIRTUE OF THE BAPTISM OF WHICH HE SPOKE TO HIM: IF I HAVE TOLD YOU EARTHLY THINGS AND YOU DO NOT BELIEVE THEM, HOW SHALL I BELIEVE? WHAT IF I TELL YOU HEAVENLY THINGS? — He who makes the efficacy of baptism depend on this material sign is not a spiritual man, and the heavenly gift can be obtained only on the condition that it is believed by faith, not by water only that our souls are renewed. Water strikes the eyes of the body, but the Holy Spirit, whom we do not see, operates in the soul and inspires faith in it. As the water cleanses the defilements of the body, the Holy Spirit purifies the soul of his sins; the material element produces a material effect, the Holy Spirit produces all things spiritual, and these are the effects which are chiefly to be considered in baptism. What we hear there is a virtue superior to what we see. Now, as Nicodemus was under the influence of all material ideas, the Savior has recourse to a very just comparison to attract him to the faith, and to confirm the truth of an invisible thing, he gives him the example of a visible fact, which is perceived only by

**QUESTION 16.** THE SAVIOR SAYS THAT JOHN'S BAPTISM CAME FROM HEAVEN, SO WHY DO YOU SAY NICODEMUS'S BAPTISM TO HIM? — If I have told you earthly things and you do not believe them, and so on. These words of the Lord: "If I have told you earthly things and you do not believe them," do not relate to baptism, for we know that our baptism, though having water for matter, is all spiritual; but there is a celestial mystery here. It is not water that purifies, but God, who acts in an invisible and incomprehensible manner. He wants to give an example of this truth by saying: "The wind blows where it wills, and you hear its voice, but you do not know where it comes from or where it is going." By this comparison, he wished to lead Nicodemus into believing that man received a new birth from the water and the Holy Spirit, without being able to understand how it was done. is a very spiritual operation. This is how you hear the voice of the spirit, that is, the wind, but you do not know where it comes from or where it is going; so you do not know how the change takes place in the one who receives a new birth, however you realize that it is done, because this change is sensible for you. In fact, if the wind blows where it wants, how much more can the Spirit, who is of God, sanctify all

hearing and not by sight, though it is not disputed, and yet it is an earthly fact because it is one of the phenomena of this world. Our Lord therefore tells Nicodemus to persuade him: "The wind blows where it wills, you hear its voice, but you do not know where it comes from or where it is going, so is every man who is born of the Spirit "(Jn. 3:8), that is, as you hear, but without perceiving, as has been said, the voice of the blowing wind, words that express the effects of baptism, but we do not see how the Holy Spirit produces these effects: we hear the words that announce what will be done by the one who pronounces them, and whose purpose is to inspire faith, but not to give reason for the action itself, and as this comparison was not yet sufficient to bring Nicodemus to faith, the Savior said to him: "If you do not believe when I speak to you of the things of the earth, how will you believe when I speak to you about things that are in heaven? These earthly things he has said is the comparison he has just made; that is to say, if the earthly comparison of the blowing wind cannot lead you to believe this fact, because you do not see how it occurs, how could you believe if I brought you celestial reasons that you do not know? One can persuade a man what he does not know by means of what he knows; so when God says of Jesus Christ that he is his true son, or cannot understand as it is done; but as we know the manner of

those he wants? Our Lord says: "He breathes where He wills," because every creature, though subject to laws, is, however, left to His freedom, and if anyone claims that this spirit which is blowing is the Holy Spirit, he is in error, since the Savior takes this spirit as a term of comparison to persuade Nicodemus of the regeneration of man by water and the Spirit, a regeneration which he could not bring himself to believe. The object which it serves to demonstrate if, therefore, our Lord makes use of comparison here, this sensible spirit, which is called the wind, is not the Holy Spirit, He wished to persuade Nicodemus of a spiritual reason, and triumph over his doubts, he brings him the example of the wind to make it easier for him to believe the existence and action of the Holy Spirit, but we know that the Holy Spirit came from heaven to spread in the world the soul of believers, as we see he came upon the Apostles in the beginning of the Church, and the voice of the Holy Spirit is compared to a big noise. "And suddenly a noise came from heaven like a violent wind." (Acts. 2:2) In what follows, the sacred writer calls this sound a voice the works of the Holy Spirit to confirm the word of the Savior. Is this not what these words mean: "And suddenly a noise came from heaven like a violent wind." He wants us to understand that the Holy Spirit came down with a noise like a violent wind, so he took the wind for the sake of comparison, adding, "This

birth of children according to the flesh, we believe that by saying Christ is my true Son, God meant that he had begotten him of his own substance. This is how he wants us to understand in the Savior what the word and the spirit of man cannot explain by what is sensible and can be understood, that is to say that he wanted to render credible the action of the Holy Spirit, which cannot be understood by the example of the will, which the senses perceive and the ear hears. So again, we read in the Acts of the Apostles: "Suddenly a noise came from heaven, like a violent wind coming near, and filled the whole house where they sat, and so on. (Acts 2:2) The sacred author shows us that the Holy Spirit came from heaven as the wind, and with a noise like that of a violent wind blowing on the earth. Jeremiah also compares the Spirit to the wind in these words: "The wind is blowing in all countries." Now, just as he is in this world and circulates everywhere, we do not know where he comes from or where he is going. The Holy Spirit, on the contrary, descends from heaven, as we have read, to enlighten all who believe in him. How then to explain what the Savior said about the Holy Spirit. "The wind blows where he wills, and you hear his voice, but you do not know where he comes from, or where he is going," since he wanted to rely on a comparison here? He adds, "This is so with every man born of the Spirit." (Jn. 3:8) Is it not evident that he wanted to

is so with every man born of the spirit." We do not know where the wind comes from, but the Holy Spirit descends from heaven.

compare the Spirit with the wind? But they think that it is not wind that is in question, because he says: "It blows where He wills," as if every creature, though subject to the laws that govern it, was not left to his freedom. We ourselves go and do what we want, while being subject to a law, which is why we will report on our actions. It may still be admitted, and this opinion is not contrary to reason, that to express the effect produced by the Holy Spirit, he chose it himself as an example. The question seems to me to be solved in all its aspects.

**(John 5:18)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 31. THE SABBATH IS CERTAINLY THE LAW OR PART OF THE LAW; HOW THEN IS THE LAW NOT DESTROYED BY THESE WORDS OF THE EVANGELIST: "NOT ONLY BECAUSE HE HAD BROKEN THE SABBATH, BUT ALSO BECAUSE HE SAID THAT GOD WAS HIS OWN FATHER?"**— The Savior violated the Sabbath, but without breaking the Sabbath law. This Sabbath law ceased to oblige, but the Jews claimed that it was still in all its strength; In their thought, therefore, the Savior, in acting on the Sabbath, and commanding this paralytic to carry his bed on the Sabbath, violated the Sabbath law. In fact, as this law had ceased to be mandatory, it is as if it were said of an ex-governor who would have received whatever outrage, that it is to the very dignity of governor that this contempt. The Sabbath law was not violated; but

men who wanted to brazenly support the authority of the Sabbath were thwarted, since a new law had succeeded the Sabbath law.

**(John 5:46)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT&NT**

**QUESTION 2.** THE GOSPEL DECLARES THAT NO ONE HAS SEEN GOD (JN. 5:46, 1 TIM. 6:16, JN. 1:18); WHILE JACOB, MOSES, AND ISAIAH CLAIM TO HAVE SEEN HIM. IT MAY BE SAID: NO ONE HAS. SEEN THE FATHER; WHAT CAN THIS DO? IF WE HAVE SEEN THE SON, WE HAVE SEEN THE FATHER, SINCE THE FATHER AND THE SON ARE ONE GOD IN THEIR NATURE, IN THEIR IMAGE, FOR BOTH HAVE ONLY ONE IMAGE, AND AS THE SAVIOR SAYS: THE ONE WHO SEES ME ALSO SEES MY FATHER. (JN. 14:9) HOW IS IT THEN THAT NO ONE HAS SEEN GOD THE FATHER, SINCE THE SON TESTIFIES THAT WE SEE THE FATHER WHEN WE SEE HIM, BECAUSE THERE IS NO OTHER GOD. IF, THEN, THERE IS NONE ELSE, IT IS HIMSELF WHOM WE HAVE SEEN AS GOD, SINCE THERE IS ONLY ONE. — It is from God the Father that the Evangelist wants to speak when he says that no one has seen God, except the only Son who is in the bosom of the Father and who has made it known to us. (Jn. 1:18) Let us then mark to the Son, He taught us that no one except He saw God. Now, he speaks in this way to teach us that it is he who has constantly appeared to the patriarchs and the prophets. These words, therefore, do not apply to the only God, but to the Person of the Father whom we cannot call otherwise than God the Father. As for the Son, he declares that he has been seen, but in an invisible way for those who thought he saw him. The vision here is the intellect, because it is not in the eyes of the body but in the eyes of the intellect that he was manifested, and to have seen him, it is to have understood that God revealed himself in this appearance. Now, when the Savior says, "He who sees me, see also my Father," (Jn. 14:9) he wants to speak not of the vision of the eyes, but of the mind, and to make us understand that there is no difference between the Father and the Son. Neither were seen in their nature. In apparitions, the Son has been seen only by the intellect and not by the eyes of the body, because he is invisible as the Father.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(John 6:44; Romans 9:16-18)	(John 6:44; Romans 9:16-18)
<p><b>QUESTION 79.</b> IF WE ARE THE MASTERS OF OUR WILL, WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "NO ONE COMES TO ME UNLESS MY FATHER, WHO SENT ME, DRAWS HIM?" THE APOSTLE EXPRESSES HIMSELF IN SIMILAR TERMS: "IT IS NOT ENOUGH TO WANT OR TO RUN, GOD MUST HAVE MERCY"; AND AGAIN: "HE HAS MERCY ON WHOM HE PLEASES, AND HE LETS HIM HARDEN WHOM HE PLEASES." HOW DOES THE WILL REMAIN FREE IF IT IS TRAINED FOR GOOD OR EVIL, ACCORDING TO A FOREIGN WILL? — Things are quite different from what you claim, and the meaning of these words is by no means the one you give them. Free will has nothing to fear here, and if you want to deepen the meaning of these words, you will see that they are still one of the strongest supports of free will. Jesus speaks here to the Jews, whose hostile dispositions he knew. By a shameful dissimulation which arose from a feeling of envy, they affirmed that Joseph was his father, and his children were the brothers of the Savior, in order not to believe that he was the Son of God. It was then that he said to them, "No one can come to me unless my Father, who sent me, draws him." Now, how did the Father draw on the Son, if not by the works he was doing by the Son?</p>	<p><b>QUESTION 32.</b> IF WE LIVE WITH THE DISPOSITION OF OUR FREE WILL, WHY DID THE SAVIOR SAY, "NO ONE COMES TO ME UNLESS MY FATHER DRAWS HIM?" WHY DOES THE APOSTLE SPEAKING IN THE SAME SENSE EXPRESS HIMSELF IN THESE TERMS: "IT DOES NOT DEPEND ON THE ONE WHO WANTS, NOR ON THE ONE WHO RUNS, BUT ON GOD WHO HAS MERCY?" THESE WORDS SEEM TO CONSIDERABLY INFLUENCE THE FREE WILL OF THE WILL. IF NO ONE COMES WITHOUT BEING ATTRACTED, THERE IS NO MORE FAULT FOR HIM WHO DOES NOT COME, SINCE HE IS NOT DRAWN. AND IF IT IS NOT THE ONE WHO ASKS AND RUNS WHO RECEIVES, BUT GOD GIVES HIS GRACE TO WHOMEVER HE WANTS, MUST BE DISCHARGED FROM ALL SIN ONE WHO WANTS AND DOES NOT GET TO DROP THE WHOLE BLAME ON THE ONE WHO DESPISES THE PRAYERS ADDRESSED TO HIM. — The cause of free will cannot be compromised by these words. If you apply them to the truth on which they were said, you will see that they serve rather as the defense of free will. Indeed, the Jews, by a malicious inspiration, said of the Savior: "Is not</p>

This is what the Son himself says: "The Father who dwells in me does the works that I do," (Jn. 14:10) so that these works would attract. The miracles of the Savior were proof that God was his Father, so that he who maintained that he had another father was not attracted to God the Father. God did these works by Jesus Christ so that men could believe in the words by which He affirmed that He was the Son of God. This is not a violent attraction, it is the testimony that God gives back to Jesus Christ, and he who believes in this testimony, the Father draws him to Jesus Christ, for no one can believe in the Savior except the one who knows that he has God for his Father. It is not to undermine free will that the Apostle has expressed the truth of which you are asking a question here, but it is to defend the man from putting into discussion the judgments from God that he proclaims his righteousness here, for God knows to whom he must have mercy. He scrutinizes the depths of hearts and sees whether the inner dispositions of the one who prays make him worthy to receive the effect of his prayer. In fact, God tells us through his prophet, "This people honors me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me." (Isa. 19:13) It is therefore his justice to harden the soul of the hypocrite; for he who gives to the truth the name of falsehood not by error, but by a guilty intention, and who, while understanding what is good, pretends

he the son of Joseph? Do not we know his father? How can he say: I came down from heaven?" (Jn. 6:42) Then Jesus answered them, "No one can come to me unless my Father who sent me draws him." Let us now see how the Father draws to his Son. Let us take these words of the Savior Himself: "The works that I do is my Father who does them. Believe that I am in my Father and my Father in me." (Jn. 14:10) If, then, the Father works in the Son and the works he makes invite to faith, Our Lord is right to say; "No one comes to me unless my Father draws him." The Father draws when he acts through the Son. How can one who asks for faith in him destroy the will of free will? How can one who convinces a man of unbelief draw him in spite of himself? It is to the Jews who gave him another father than his true Father that he keeps this language. No one, in fact, can believe in the Savior except by recognizing that God is his Father. If the Apostle, on his side, expresses himself in this way, it is not to undermine free will, but to show the justice of the judgments of God, which cannot be deceived when he gives or refuse his mercy. One implores mercy and does not deserve to receive it, the other demands it, and he is worthy of obtaining it. He asks for it not only by his words but by his works; this only implores him with the end of his lips, while the other joins with his words a contrite heart and thus assures the effect of his prayer. What does God

to ignore what good is to transform it into evil, deserves to be condemned to lose with the intelligence of the good his rights to salvation, to which he renounces. It is not right, in fact, to save in spite of himself a man who scorns salvation not out of ignorance, but out of mischief and envy. These words confirm free will rather than destroy it, since each is treated here according to his will.

say, indeed, in the law? "This people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me." (Isa. 19:13) If, then, two men pray the same prayer and only one is granted, we must be convinced that prayer has made him worthy to receive what he asked, for God is just and gives his graces only wisely. You see, then, that free will, far from being destroyed, is confirmed. If you were told that two men addressed to God the same prayer, in the same spirit, and with the same works, and that one of them was granted, and the other rejected, you would have the right to say that there is no longer free will and that God is a respecter of persons.

### (John 7:8-14)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 78.** WE READ IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN THAT THE SAVIOR, AFTER SAYING THAT HE WOULD NOT GO TO JERUSALEM FOR THE FEAST DAY, WENT THERE SECRETLY, HOWEVER. IS NOT THIS AN ACT OF INCONSTANCY? —You always present your questions in an abbreviated form that hides their meaning. The fact of which you speak here took place when Jesus was in Galilee, because of the agitation of the Jews against him; his parents, who did not yet believe in him, urged him, as he approached a feast of the Jews, to go to Judea to expose him after a sedition. The Savior answered them, "Go to this feast, because the world does not

hate you; but he hates me because I condemn their works. I'm not going to this festivity because my time has not come yet. His brethren then went to this feast, and Jesus remained in Galilee." Where is the contradiction here? He does not go to this festivity when he declares that he is not going, he does not go there until later, and he does not go for the festivity itself, but as if he were going to a discussion, to a judgment. All the others had gone to this festivity to enjoy the pleasure it promised them. For the Savior, his feast day was when he redeemed the world with his passion. It is then that he says, "Now the son of man is glorified, and God is glorified in him." (Jn. 13:31) His feast day is when he triumphed over death.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(John 7:39; 14:15-17; 20:22; Acts 2:1)	(John 7:39; 14:15-17; 20:22; Acts 2:1)

**QUESTION 93.** WE MUST CONSIDER WHETHER THE APOSTLES HAD THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE TIME THEY WERE ON THE EARTH WITH THE LORD, FOR THE EVANGELIST SAYS: "THE HOLY SPIRIT HAD NOT YET BEEN GIVEN, BECAUSE JESUS CHRIST WAS NOT YET GLORIFIED." AND IN ANOTHER PLACE: "IF YOU LOVE ME," SAID JESUS TO HIS DISCIPLES, "KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS. AND I WILL PRAY THE FATHER, AND HE WILL GIVE YOU ANOTHER COUNSELOR, TO BE WITH YOU FOREVER, EVEN THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, WHOM THE WORLD CANNOT RECEIVE, BECAUSE IT NEITHER SEES HIM NOR KNOWS HIM; YOU KNOW HIM, FOR HE

**QUESTION 42.** DID THE APOSTLES HAVE THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE TIME THEY WERE WITH THE LORD, FOR THE EVANGELIST SAYS: "THE HOLY SPIRIT HAD NOT YET BEEN GIVEN, BECAUSE JESUS CHRIST WAS NOT YET GLORIFIED." AND IN ANOTHER PLACE: "IF YOU LOVE ME," SAID JESUS TO HIS DISCIPLES, "KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS. AND I WILL PRAY THE FATHER, AND HE WILL GIVE YOU ANOTHER COUNSELOR, TO BE WITH YOU FOREVER, EVEN THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, WHOM THE WORLD CANNOT RECEIVE, BECAUSE IT NEITHER SEES HIM NOR KNOWS HIM; YOU KNOW HIM, FOR HE DWELLS WITH YOU, AND WILL

DWELLS WITH YOU, AND WILL BE IN YOU." WHAT DO THESE WORDS MEAN? THE EVANGELIST DENIES THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT WAS GIVEN BEFORE PASSION, AND JESUS PROMISES TO PRAY TO HIS FATHER TO SEND HIM; AND ON THE OTHER HE ADDS THAT THIS SPIRIT WAS WITH THEM AND DWELT IN THEM. WE READ THAT AFTER HIS RESURRECTION HE BLEW ON THE APOSTLES AND SAID TO THEM, "RECEIVE THE HOLY SPIRIT." THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES TELL US AGAIN THAT HE CAME DOWN ON THE APOSTLES ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST. I SEE SO MANY CONTRADICTIONS IN THESE DIFFERENT ASSERTIONS THAT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT TO DO WITH THEM. — These different propositions have a different object, which is characterized in a summary but precise manner. There is one and the same Spirit, but his gifts are multiplied. When, therefore, they speak to you of the Holy Spirit, they must not be separated from their office in which they are as personified. That he was with the apostles and that he had to come, is an indisputable truth, but in hearing it from the person and not from nature. Jesus Christ promised, in fact, to send from his Father another comforter, but in the sense that their divine nature being the

BE IN YOU." WHAT DO THESE WORDS MEAN? THE EVANGELIST DENIES THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT WAS GIVEN BEFORE PASSION, AND JESUS PROMISES TO PRAY TO HIS FATHER TO SEND HIM; AND ON THE OTHER HE ADDS THAT THIS SPIRIT WAS WITH THEM AND DWELT IN THEM. WE READ THAT AFTER HIS RESURRECTION HE BLEW ON THE APOSTLES AND SAID TO THEM, "RECEIVE THE HOLY SPIRIT." THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES TELL US AGAIN THAT HE CAME DOWN ON THE APOSTLES ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST. I SEE SO MANY CONTRADICTIONS IN THESE DIFFERENT ASSERTIONS THAT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT TO DO WITH THEM. — These different propositions have a different object, which is characterized in a summary manner, etc. It is certain that the Holy Spirit was given to the faithful only after the Lord's victory over death and his glorious resurrection. Before his ascension, the Savior gave his Apostles the form in which the faithful should receive the Holy Spirit after their baptism, a form still faithfully observed by the bishops. We therefore see in the person of the apostles three different forms of ministry which are conferred by the Holy Spirit. The first form is general; it was given on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit

same, the presence of Jesus Christ does not carry away the absence of the Holy Spirit, just as the coming and manifestation of the Holy Spirit does not exclude the presence of Jesus Christ. So when he promises his disciples the coming of the Holy Spirit, he says to them, "You will see him, because he will remain with you and he will be in you. (Jn. 14:17) He gives them the assurance that after the ascension of the Lord they will have a pastor to protect them and a king whose power is neither inferior nor less excellent. For it is certain that the Holy Spirit was given only to those who believed that in the time marked by the Evangelist, when the Lord had triumphed over death and was gloriously resurrected from the grave. This is what the Savior expressly says to his disciples after his triumphant resurrection: "and John baptized you in water, but you will be baptized in the Holy Spirit that you will receive in a few days." He spoke to them thus in the time when he was preparing to go up to his Father. When the Lord, a few days after his resurrection, breathes on his apostles and says to them, "Receive the Holy Spirit," (Jn. 20:22) He communicates to them the ecclesiastical power. As in the exercise of the powers conferred by the Lord, everything is done by the Holy Spirit, when he gives them the rule and the form of this divine institution, he says to them: "Receive the Holy Spirit." And to show that it is in fact the power

descended not only upon the apostles, but upon all the faithful, who then issued in various languages the greatness of God as the children of the same people. The second form is special. It is not given to all the faithful, it is exclusively reserved for the bishops; it communicates the power of giving, by the laying on of hands, the Holy Spirit to the baptized faithful. It may, however, be called general for the bishops. The third form has been granted only to the apostles, to perform the miracles and wonders necessary for the growth of faith, for the seeds of faith are the wonders wrought by the apostles. The Holy Spirit was therefore given to the apostles according to the order of these different ministries. He descended first on them as on the other faithful on the day of Pentecost. They then received him as first priests and to give as bishops the Holy Spirit to the faithful by laying hands on them. The gift of miracles received by the apostles was a special grace to time rather than to people; they received this gift because it was the time when the Lord spread His graces on the earth, and the power to work miracles by the Holy Spirit was communicated to them for the edification of the faithful. So they received, at the time Our Lord sent them, the power to cast out demons and to perform other wonders, to command demons or various diseases without invoking his name, and to see their commandment followed by the

conferred on the Church, he adds: "He whose sins you have retained will be withheld from him, and to whom you have forgiven them, they will be forgiven." This insufflation is therefore a grace which is communicated by tradition to those who are ordained, and which impresses them with a more impressive and more sacred character, which is why the Apostle says to Timothy: "Do not neglect the grace which is in you, and given to you with the laying on of the hands of the priests." (1 Tim. 4:14) This is what the Savior had to do once, so that it was well established in the Church that the transmission of this power could not take place without the Holy Spirit. Just as the Savior wanted to give in his person a visible example that the Holy Spirit was given after baptism to all who believed in him; so he wanted to give us here a definite proof that the transmission of ecclesiastical power was inseparable from the infusion of the Holy Spirit. The apostles, like the prophets, have the power to perform miracles in the very presence of the Lord. We therefore see in the person of the apostles three different forms of ministry conferred upon them by the Holy Spirit. The first is ecclesiastical power to regenerate the faithful and to fulfill the other duties of the sacred ministry. The second, which was given at Pentecost, is general, for it is not only on the apostles, but on all the faithful, that the Holy Spirit

healing. They acted under the same power that the prophets Elijah and Elisha had received to perform their wonders. Now the Savior said to his disciples, "Truly, truly, I say to you, if you ask anything from my Father in my name, he will give it to you. Ask, and you will receive." (Jn. 16:23) So if the apostles did their miracles without invoking the name of the Savior, it is not, however, under the power of that divine name; for by the same that they were sent by him who was the terror of demons and sufferings, the mere fear of his name put the demons to flight, and healed the infirmities. So it was the name of the Lord who secretly operated all these wonders. In fact, listen to what the Apostle St. Peter said to the Jews: "It is in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth that you have denied and crucified that this man is here before you, standing and healthy, for no other name under heaven has been given to men by which we shall be saved. "(Acts 4:16).

descended. The third was given to the apostles alone, to perform miracles and wonders until the seeds of faith which they shed in hearts were sufficiently developed. These seeds of faith were the wonders performed by the apostles. God established them as the pontiffs of truth, to testify by the miracles and wonders they performed that our faith was according to reason. Indeed, what stronger proof of the truth than a miracle? This is what falsifies all the philosophical systems of the earth, is that they are but a tissue of vain words, without the support of the testimony of the miracle which would testify the immutable truth of their doctrine. The Holy Spirit is therefore generally given to all the faithful, in whose soul it remains as a proof that they are the sons of God. On the contrary, are they miracles and wonders to be done? The Holy Spirit does not abide in man; he comes into him when he is called, he inspires what is necessary, and withdraws. It is the same in the transmission of sacred powers or in ordination; grace is external, and interior help is given only to souls full of faith.

**(John 8:44)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 98. ON THE GOSPEL OF SAINT JOHN.** — You have heard the testimony of the holy Gospel in these words of Our Lord to the Jews: "You are of your father the devil, and your will is to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, and has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies." (John 8:44) None of the faithful must doubt that the devil was the only author of his apostasy. He is the principle and the leader of all error, seeing that God had given him an extraordinary power by creating an extraordinary power, dared to carry his ambitious plans even to the Divinity, in order to place himself as God above those whom he had saw below him. Now the names of devil and Satan given to him come from his works and not from his nature. Every evil is recognized by works, and it is not nature that is guilty of it, but the will which is determined by certain motives. He saw that he was superior to others, and pride made him aspire to domination. But why does the Scriptures seem to give a father to the one who was the author of his crime? or how to prove that he was homicide from the beginning? (1) Here the Scripture gives its name to the one who has been his imitator; for as his works have earned him the name of devil, every man guilty of a bad action deserves that name. It is therefore Cain whom the Savior here calls the devil, because he has made himself his imitator by becoming envious of his brother, by putting him to death, and leaving such an awful example of fratricidal cruelty. The devil, envious of the man whom God had created in his image, put the height of his wickedness by giving the example of error and falsehood. Cain follows this path of lying when God asks him, "Where is your brother Abel?" (Gen. 4:9) Full of his father's mischief, he does not hesitate to immediately make this lying answer: "I do not know." He pretends to not know where he is of whom he had just taken the life of; cruelty blinded him to make him answer to God as to a man to whom he hoped to hide his crime. Now the Jews became his imitators, and put to death the Lord himself; they preferred to have Cain's fratricide father as God, thus rendering themselves guilty of all the blood that had been shed. In putting to death the source of life, they became the perpetrators of the crime in all its extent, and made the responsibility fall upon their children, when they shouted, "May his

blood be upon us and our children." (Matt. 27:25) To persuade Pilate that they did not ask him for anything wrong, they consented that this action, if it was unfair, would fall upon their children; With this burning desire to satisfy their fury, they do not even think of sparing their children. Now, a proof that the devil is not evil of his nature, is that God would not threaten punishment who did not do what he did not know, for it would be wrong to punish the one who acts in accordance with the requirements of its nature. And this injustice is greater still, if you ask a man what you know him to be impossible. On the contrary, justice demands that one punish who knows and can do good, does not fail to do evil. This is what can be concluded from the words of the Savior, for he says to the Jews, as we have said above, "Your father was murderous from the beginning, and he did not remain in the truth." Now, if he was a liar by his nature, why say he did not remain in the truth? Not to dwell in truth is not to persevere in truth. Finally, we read in the Prophet these words of the Lord: "Had they remained in my substance," (Jer. 23:22) to say in my law. The Apostle also said to the Galatians, "Stay firm, and do not put yourself under the yoke of bondage." (Gal 5:1) What is clearer? St. Paul recommends that the faithful continue to persevere in the commandments of God. If the demon had observed them, he would have remained in the substance and in the law of God, for the law is an unshakable foundation for those who observe it. How, then, have some of them been able to say that God created the devil to be evil, or that he had an origin of his own, that is to say, that he owed it to no one else, double supposition also offensive to God? He who maintains that God created the devil to be evil, attributes to him a very imperfect kindness, for a perfectly good being cannot do evil. As for the one who does not believe that the devil draws from God his origin, he denies the sovereign domain of God, because he believes he can remove from this domain that extends to everything a thing that would be independent. Those who make such mistakes will be severely punished when they see that God will judge all things through Jesus Christ.

(1) It is not found in the manuscripts of the second category, this repetition of the same subject has already been treated in question 90.

**(John 8:44)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 90.** IF THE DEVIL IS SATAN HIMSELF, WHY DOES OUR LORD SAY TO THE JEWS, "THE FATHER OF WHOM YOU ARE BORN IS THE DEVIL, AND YOU WANT TO FULFILL THE DESIRES OF YOUR FATHER. HE WAS MURDERER FROM THE BEGINNING, AND HE DID NOT REMAIN IN THE TRUTH, FOR THE TRUTH IS NOT IN HIM. WHEN HE UTTERS A LIE, HE SAYS IT IS HIS OWN, FOR HE IS A LIAR LIKE HIS FATHER\*." — The devil's name is not a particular name, but a common name. No matter where we find the works of the devil we are allowed to give him that name. This is the name that suits his works rather than his nature. This father of the Jews whom Our Lord wants to speak in this place is Cain, whom they wanted to be the imitators by putting the Savior to death. This is why he declares that he has not remained in the truth, because he is defiled by a murderer and has made himself worthy of death; it was he who gave men the first example of fratricide. Our Lord says that when he utters lies, he says what is proper to him to make sure that no one sin only by his own will, but as he himself was a devil's imitator, he adds, "Because he is a liar like his father." This spirit of falsehood pretended, in fact, to ignore the commandment which God had given to the first man, to condemn him to death. This is how Cain, when God questions him, pretends to ignore where his brother Abel was, whom he had put to death. The devil here in the Savior's thought is therefore Cain, and his father is the devil whose works he imitated. The son of the devil is himself a devil. But the devil who is called Satan has no father, author of his wickedness. He is himself the author of his own malice. He was the first to set an example of sin, and all who imitate him will be called his children, as he is called their father. This is how our father is Abraham, because he has the first faith in God, and as such we are his children, because we bear the name of faithful, as he has deserved himself.

\* The author of this question gives to these last words of the Savior a meaning required by the explanation he makes of it, but opposed to the generally accepted interpretation which translates: "He is a liar and the father of lies."

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
<p><b>(John 8:44)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 80.</b> EVERYONE IS NECESSARILY THE SON OF GOD OR THE SON OF THE DEVIL, HE IS THEREFORE ALWAYS SONS, SOMETIMES OF GOD, SOMETIMES OF THE DEVIL; WHY THEN IS IT COMMANDED US TO TAKE A SECOND BIRTH?</p> <p>— The children of Israel, whom God had rescued from Egypt, having not ceased to hear him, the angry Lord pronounced against them the sentence that none of them would enter the promised land, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua, son of Nave, who was previously called Auses. As for those born in the desert, he promised them that they would enter because they knew neither good nor evil. Now ignorance of good and evil is a certain natural simplicity which has not been learned in the science of evil. It is an ignorance without malice. We are born, indeed, without any feeling, but our nature is so good that it is able to learn the truth. But the son of the devil, who from his birth is plunged into evil, makes profession of errors contrary to the Creator, he asserts that there are several gods, and that they must be sacrificed as the masters of the world. If, however, he regains feelings that are better and more in keeping with his nature by returning to his Creator, he will become God's son. Thus men are not sons of God, nor sons of the devil</p>	<p><b>(John 8:44)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 41.</b> HE WHO IS NOT A SON OF GOD IS CERTAINLY OF THE DEVIL; HE IS THEREFORE ALWAYS THE SON SOMETIMES OF GOD, SOMETIMES OF THE DEVIL. WE MUST, THEREFORE, SERIOUSLY CONSIDER WHETHER WE ARE BORN OF GOD, OR OF THE DEVIL, OR WHETHER A THIRD SUPPOSITION CAN BE ADMITTED. — The children of Israel, whom God had drawn from Egypt, having not ceased to offer him, the angry Lord did not permit any of them to enter the promised land with the exception of Caleb and Joshua, son of Nave. As for their children who were born in the desert, he promised them that they would enter, because they knew neither good nor evil. Now, the ignorance of good and evil is a certain natural simplicity which has been instructed neither of good nor of evil, it is an ignorance without malice. We are born in indeed, without any feeling, but our nature is able to learn the truth. But the son of the devil, who from his birth is plunged into evil and professing errors contrary to the Creator, asserts that there are many gods and that they must be sacrificed to the masters of the world. If this man returns to better feelings and returns to the path of natural justice, by receiving faith in Jesus Christ, he will become</p>

by birth. What does the Savior say to the Jews? "You have the devil for father, and you want to fulfill your father's desires." (Jn. 8:44) As you can see, it is through works and by their way of life that men become children of the devil; the children of God are those who confess that God is the true father of Christ, and whose life is in accordance with that belief. God's purpose in creating our nature has been that we are born without any preconceived feeling, but that we have the power to learn either good or evil, that we are capable of merit or demerit, so that we may find in ourselves the joy that follows the reward due to good works, or that we only blame ourselves if our bad actions bring us a sentence of condemnation.

God's son. Thus men are neither sons of God nor sons of the devil by birth. What does the Savior say to the Jews? "You have the devil for father, and you want to fulfill your father's desires." (Jn. 8:44) It is therefore through their works and their way of life that men become children of the devil. God's purpose in creating our nature has been that we are born without any preconceived feelings, but that we may be instructed in our choice in the science of good or evil, so that we find in ourselves the joy that follows the reward due to good works, or that we are only responsible for ourselves, if our bad deeds bring us a sentence of condemnation. God has left us to our own will to take away any pretense of complaining of the evils we might deserve, and to give us the right to rejoice in the crown that we could obtain after becoming the children of God by faith. God, the creator and author of our nature, wanted us to have something that was our own, so that we could justly glorify the faith we have in God. For he who is not master of himself has nothing of himself from what he seems to have; he can neither glorify his good works nor be condemned for bad ones.

**(John 9:6)**

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 33.** WHY DID THE LORD, WHO HAD HEALED ALMOST ALL THE SICK OF A SINGLE WORD, GIVE SIGHT TO THE BLIND MAN BY APPLYING MUD TO HIS EYES? — The Lord acts in this way to confound those who accuse the Creator. In healing an unplanned vice of the body, in the same way that God has used to create it, he raises the authority of the Creator. In fact, he heals this infirmity of the body by the means which God has used to form him. Now, one must necessarily approve of an action which, in order to bring a thing back to the perfection from which it was fallen, employs the means which served to establish it there. If, indeed, the Savior proves that he is God by reforming the imperfections and vices of the body, how much more must we recognize the divinity of the one to whom the body owes its existence?

**(John 10:9)**

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 34.** WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "I AM THE DOOR," THOSE WHO CAME BEFORE ME ARE ROBBERS AND THIEVES, WORDS THAT SEEM TO ATTACK THE AUTHORITY OF THE PROPHETS? — As no one can go to God the Father except through faith in Jesus Christ, the Savior declares that He is the door of the kingdom of heaven. But in comparing himself to the door, what need was it to say of those who had preceded him: "All those who came before me, etc.," since there was no question of the past, but that was it to establish that he was now the door? The Savior therefore has in view the Jews who claimed to enter the kingdom of heaven not by faith, but by the justice of the law. They came before the Savior, that is to say, they stood before him to distort and contradict his words, and thus to distract others from believing in him. That's why he calls them robbers and thieves. In fact, he held this language to them, while the Pharisees were arguing with the blind man whom he had healed by giving him the use of the eyes, that nature had refused him, and that they were diverting him from

the faith of the Savior, telling him that one could not enter into the kingdom of heaven through one who violated the Sabbath, but through the justice of the law. It is then that Jesus says to them: "I am the door, if someone enters by me, he will find pasture, but if someone wants to enter elsewhere, he is a robber and a thief." Now, how can these words be applied to the prophets? Did the prophets teach against the doctrine of Jesus Christ, that they could make themselves acceptable to God without the faith and the only righteousness of the law, they who were charged to announce the enthralling of the Son of God? The Savior therefore wanted to speak of those who lived in his time, and to make us understand that all who were before him, sitting or standing, were robbers and thieves. By calling in particular the one who had been blind, they wanted to prevent him from believing in the Savior. "Give glory to God," said they to him, "we know that this man is a sinner," a charge which he destroys by replying to them: "We have never heard that no one opened the eyes of a blind man." If he was not of God, he could do nothing. It is therefore of this man who persevered in faith, and of those who said: These words are not the words of a man who is possessed of the devil whom the Savior wishes to speak when he says, "But the sheep have not listened to them," that is to say, those whom he calls robbers and thieves. For how could it be admitted that the sheep did not listen to the prophets, while we know without doubt that the good have always been compliant to the teachings of the prophets, as the bad to the false prophets?

### (John 11:35)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 35. WHY DOES OUR LORD ON THE VERGE OF EXPLODING AN ASTONISHING AND UNKNOWN POWER UNTIL THEN, IN THE RESURRECTION OF LAZARUS, SHED TEARS AND ASK WHERE HE IS AS IF HE WAS IGNORANT? —** The Savior is at once God and man, he always presents himself to us under these two characters, because he has the affections of man, he shed tears, and because he is God, he resurrects the one he's crying over. It rises, so always lower to higher equity and fighting the prejudice that saw in him the man, proving by his works that he was God.

**(John 12:41; Acts 7:55; Isaiah 6:1)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 88.** IF GRACE WAS MORE ABUNDANT AND INTELLIGENCE CLEARER UNDER THE NEW TESTAMENT THAN IN THE OLD, WHY DID THE PROPHET ISAIAH SEE ON THE THRONE OF HIS MAJESTY THE GOD OF ARMIES WHICH IS THE CHRIST, ACCORDING TO THE EXPLANATION OF THE EVANGELIST ST. JOHN WHO SAID: "ISAIAH PROPHESIED THUS WHEN HE SAW HIS GLORY AND SPOKE OF HIM; WHILE UNDER THE NEW TESTAMENT, STEPHEN, THE FIRST OF THE MARTYRS, CLAIMS TO HAVE SEEN JESUS SITTING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD? (ACTS 7:55) HOW IS IT THAT ON ONE SIDE CHRIST APPEARS IN A SECONDARY RANK AFTER HIS TRIUMPHS, AND ON THE OTHER AS THE SOVEREIGN GOD, BEFORE HE HAS WON? — The Lord manifested himself in the manner that circumstances demanded. He appears to the prophet as a king who takes back his people, and he shows himself as he sat on his throne, for the cause of his divinity was not in question. But he appears standing up to Saint Stephen because of the accusations of the Jews, because in the person of Stephen it was the cause of the Savior whom they attacked. He therefore appears standing before God, the sovereign judge sitting on his throne, as if to defend his cause; and he is on the judge's right hand because his cause is right. Indeed, every man who pleads his case must stand up.

**(John 14:9)**

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 97.** WHAT REASONABLE ANSWER CAN ONE MAKE FROM THE LAW TO THE IMPIETY OF ARIUS? — If one must believe in reason, the very reason of the names of Father and Son is a proof of their unity. If you ask how, I will answer you that there is no true Son of God unless he has come out of the very substance of the Father. Indeed, he cannot be true Son of God, if he does not come from God. Now Scripture says he is the true Son of God, so he comes

from God. He who denies that Christ is born God contradicts Scripture, which declares that He is true Son of God, to teach us that He is born of God. For if he is not of God, and yet is called the true Son of God, Scripture misleads us. If, on the contrary, Scripture cannot deceive us, he who does not acknowledge that Christ is of God destroys the testimony of Scripture, and denies that Jesus Christ is the true Son of God. It is not the will, but the birth that makes the true Son of God. But the power of God, they say, is great enough to give the lie the characters of truth. I answer that the power of God, and that is why he is worthy of all our praises, makes truth the truth for him always, and lies always lie. It belongs only to the liar to substitute the lie for the truth, and God is incapable of it. God can do everything, it is true, but he does only what is in conformity with his truth and justice. It is certain, then, that Jesus Christ is called the true Son of God, in the proper sense, that is, born of the very substance of God. What made the Apostle say: "He did not spare his own Son." (Rom. 8:32) And in another Epistle: "who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped." (Phil. 2:6) If, therefore, he did not regard himself to be equal to God, he affirmed himself by the same true Son of God, for he could not be equal to God except so much that he was born of God. Equality is only possible between two things that are or equally true, or equally false. One cannot establish equality or unity between that which has a beginning and that which is eternal. But Jesus Christ declaring that he is one with his Father is equal to God. "The Jews," says the Evangelist, "reproached him not only for violating the Sabbath, but for affirming that his Father was God, making himself equal, that is to say, like God." (Jn. 5:18) Is it not obvious that this equality can only come from a birth properly so called? For it is by affirming that he was the proper Son, that is, the true Son of God, that he made himself equal to God. This is why he said to his disciples, "He who sees me, see my Father." (Jn. 14: 9) By the same that they are consubstantial, he who sees one sees both. Just as the Father has life in him, he has given his Son to have life in him, (Jn. 5:26) that is to say, the Father begot a son who is equal to him, and all that is to the Father is to the Son, as all that is to the Son is to the Father (Jn. 17:10), and no one can take away anything from the Father's hand or from the Son's hand. (Jn. 10:29) And he adds, "I and my Father are one. I say to you, I tell you not of myself, but my Father who dwells in me, do the works that I do. Do you not believe that I am in my Father, and that my Father is in me? Believe it, at least because of the works I do."

(Jn. 14:10) As the generation does not come from itself, but from the one who has begotten it, it attributes all that it does to the Father, to establish by all these testimonies that if he is called the true Son of God, it is because he was born of him, and so that it was not supposed that his nature was entirely outside the nature of God. The humility that appears in his words, is here all his greatness. For while he seems to humble himself by saying to his disciples, "What I say to you, I do not say it of myself, but it is my Father who dwells in me who speaks and does the works that I do," (Jn. 14:10) proves his divine origin and power, affirming that what he is, he is not of himself, but of his Father, far from Christ This is his finest title of glory, for he who speaks of himself is not the true Son of God. As you can see, the error of the Arians over the person of Jesus Christ comes precisely from what should give them a just idea. They take occasion to condemn him and to accuse him of false words which prove to the evidence that he is the true Son of God. He asks his Father to glorify him, and at the same time promises to glorify his Father to whom he addresses his prayer, and his greatness comes here from his apparent humiliation. When the Father bears witness to his Son, proclaiming his own glory, and when the Son issues the greatness of the Father, he also manifests his own glory. The greatness and nobility of the Father is the greatness and nobility of the true Son. So all that we attribute to the Father belongs to the Son, and all that we attribute to the Son belongs to the Father. Thus the Spirit whom we call the Spirit of the Father, is also called the Spirit of Jesus Christ; the Church of God is also the Church of Jesus Christ. We worship God, as we worship Jesus Christ; we serve God, we serve Jesus Christ too. The saints are called the priests of God, they are also called the priests of Jesus Christ. The holy city is enlightened by the light of God, it is also illuminated by the light of Jesus Christ. The throne of God is the same as that of Jesus Christ. God is the sovereign ruler, Jesus Christ too, for the prophet Isaiah saw Christ seated on a throne of majesty as the God of armies (Isa. 6:1); the Arians cannot deny it. It is written of God the Father that he is the King of kings and the Lord of lords. (1 Tim. 6:15) The Scripture recognizes the same titles to Jesus Christ the true Son of God. (Rev. 17:14, 19:16) Everywhere, therefore, we see perfect equality between the divinity of the Father and the divinity of the Son, and the distinction of persons in no way contradicts the unity of one God. The only difference that exists between the Father and the Son is that the Father was not begotten, and the Son was born, that is, the Father comes from

no other and that the Son comes from the Father, which is the greatness of the Son; for that is what makes us know his eternal nobility, and that he is the true Son of the true Father, a truth that these words of God express in Genesis: "Let us make man in our image and likeness." (Gen. 1:26) If they have the same image, the same resemblance, how could they not have the same nature? In fact, in spiritual things where there are no sensible forms, one thing can be similar to another only by its nature, and if two things have the same image, they must not have same substance. The Scripture tells us that they have the same image, the same resemblance to teach us that one is no different from the other, that is to say, that Jesus Christ is the true Son of God because his birth is not distinct here from him who begets. So the Jews, who understood very well that he called God his Father in the proper sense, say to Pilate: "We have a law, and according to this law he must die, because he has made himself the Son of God." (Jn. 19:7) What! the Jews have understood this truth, and the Christians say that they do not understand it; those who did not believe had the intelligence of these words, and those who claim to have faith do everything not to understand! They will admit at the same time that the prophet Isaiah, wishing to teach us that Christ God does not come from himself but from God, expresses himself in these terms: "They will walk behind you with their hands bound, we will see them worship you, pray. A good is in you, they will say, and there is no God but you. You are truly God, and we do not know it, God of Israel, O Savior!" (Isa. 45:14) These words are clear to a spirit of good faith, they clearly show that the Father is in the Son, and the Son God is of the same nature as the Father, In whom, he, in whom is God, without whom there is no other God, and who is God himself, what can be that which is God the Father, without him Is there any difference? This is really two to be one. God is in him, because although he is God, he is not of himself, but of the Father, because he is a Son, and apart from him there is no other God, because he is the only begotten Son of the Father. He is God himself, because God and Christ have only one and the same nature, so there remains no doubt here about this truth which is the object of our faith, that the Father and the Son do not have the same nature. Christ is the true Son of the true Father. This is what the prophet Jeremiah himself predicts: "He is our God," he said, "and no one else will be before him. He found all the ways of wisdom, who exposed them to Jacob his servant, to Israel his beloved. After that he was seen on the earth, and conversed with men." (Baruch, 3:36) Can we say of him who is of a

lower nature that no one else will be before him, or that he is a God different from the Father, so that this title of God turns to the prejudice of the Father? If no other God can be before him, and be outside the Father, see if you can admit the consequence, for it is full of danger. It would follow, indeed, that he would be greater than the Father. They imagine themselves to uphold the glory of the Father by separating his Son from him, and they attack him, that is to say, in their impious blindness they place the Son whose glory they wish to diminish above the Father. to whose authority they want to subjugate it. Now, Scripture to teach us that the Son does not differ from the Father (and he would be different if he were not the true Son), says that no one else will be before him, because one cannot find no other nature similar to the nature of God which is the proper nature of Christ. In fact, he could not teach us more clearly that Christ came from God than by declaring that no one else was before him. He knew that the Son was in no way inferior to the Father, and to show his perfect equality he said: "No other God will be before him," because he is like God, equal to God his Father; for he is his true Son. The Prophet again says: "He is our God," that is, the God of Israel." If it is he, he is the only God, for the Scripture says of him, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is the one and only God;" (Deut. 6:4) and yet he is not the Father, but the Son of the Father. You see, then, that the personality of the Son in no way prejudices the unity of God when we say of the Son that he is the only God, since Scripture attests it in express terms. Where does that come from? it is that the Father and the Son are but one; it is that unity is the result of nature and not of the distinction of persons; it is that they are not two, but only one. Nature is that they are not two Gods, but one God, whether it be the Father who speaks, whether the Son, is always one God who speaks. For if the Lord Himself said of man and woman. "They will not be two, but one flesh," (Matt. 19:5) how much more the Father and the Son are not two Gods, but one and the same nature? It is the birth of the Son that makes us distinguish the Father and the Son and the unity of the divinity which opposes us admitting two Gods. By what abnormality, however, do they maintain that Christ was created, that is, done, while Scripture teaches us that God did nothing without Christ? (Jn. 1:3) If nothing has been done without him, he cannot have been made himself; for if he himself is one of the things that have been done, something has been done without him. But far from us this thought, because absolutely nothing exists without him. By his birth of God, he did not begin to exist, his existence is

eternal. His birth is nothing more than an outing, and this outing is a manifestation. He was not made, he was born. To express clearly that Christ had gone out from the substance of God, this exit was given the name of birth; for as the birth is not distinct from the Father, who is its author, it was well established that Christ was consubstantial with God, and the error which said: He was when He was not found to be condemned; for how to admit the nonexistence for a single instant of the one that Scripture represents to us as proceeding from God, to teach us that he has always been in God? No one can proceed from God unless he is in God. The Arians, I know, explain this divine filiation: Christ is called the true Son of God, because God did it to be true; as if God could do something wrong. And what will become of all the proofs so strong, so incontestable, that we have previously given of the unity of the Father and the Son? If we are to adopt another sentiment here, a great number of truths which have the support of divine oracles for them will be shaken by a single discordant testimony. But let them come to this last resource so that iniquity ceases to be pleasing to them. God has therefore done it, they say, to be a true Son, his will here being the agency of birth, and the creation replaces the generation. We must give to the power of God, they add, all that is necessary for him to do things that are not like those that exist. Since they have recourse to these cunning dispositions to attack the Son of God, we turn against them the same reasons they trust so that their defeat is general in all respects. This proposition, to take it only in its meaning, is of no importance, but if it is considered in its terms, it is covered with a certain cloud which hides its meaning. It is like an Egyptian placed in darkness, for a bad cause cannot be defended by a good interpretation. They therefore resort, to defend their impiety, to sacrilegious words. If, then, the power of God could have made Christ the true Son of God without being born of him, he did it as he is, that is to say, that the creation has produced here what the generation should give. If you say that there is no difference between God and Christ, we may be able to think, given the good faith of your assertion, that the affirmation is here in conformity with reality, that Christ is truly the Son of God by that it is said that he is, and that he is of the same nature as his Father, not by generation, but by creation, because God can do everything, you say, and in particular that the created be here as the uncreated. But if, by following the path traced to you by reason, you declare that what has a beginning cannot be equal and consubstantial with what is eternal, you reveal all the deceit of your bad faith,

because to evade the meaning terms, falsely claim that Christ is the true Son of God, while denying that he is equal to God the Father; for he is not his true Son if he is not equal to him. Can we call him the true Son of God if God the Father is not truly his Father? If he is the true Son of God, the Father is also truly Father, and equality is the proof of this truth. If equality does not exist between them, one is not truer Father than the other is true Son. But as the testimony of the Scriptures, which states that Jesus Christ is the true Son of God, cannot be annulled, we must believe that he was born of God the Father, because this truth is a consequence of his equality with God that Scripture teaches us. But you, who recognize in God an incomprehensible power, you say: God cannot engender, because it is a simple nature, a language that is an insult to God the Father, for you accuse him of lying by denying that he who claims to be his true Son is indeed, and you expose your hypocrisy, because you proclaim without believing in the power of God; for if you recognize this power by asserting that it has brought out the truth from lying, which is a mockery of the truth, how much more, if you were in good faith, should you believe that what is called true indeed, and that the testimony that God the Father has given to his Son is indisputable. Indeed, the Lord said, "All things are possible to God," (Matt. 19:26) to persuade us that what is impossible for men is not for God. If you consider things only from the point of view of the flesh, you cannot admit that a virgin has borne, nor that Jonah may have lived in the belly of the whale (Jon. 2:2), nor that the dead can resurrect, nor God begot his Son, because a simple nature cannot engender, because there is no generation in this world without union. We must believe all these things or reject them all. If it is necessary to keep to the natural reason of the world, its authority must have no bounds. If, on the contrary, spiritual things have different rules, or ought to regard as carnal the one who, imbued with the principles of the world, dares to deny that something could have been done differently than he conceives it. They still resort to other tricks and ask us this question: Is it by or against his will that the Father has begot his Son? If we answer it by his will, they hasten, like the enemies of the Son of God, to draw this conclusion: So the will of God preceded the existence of the Son, and it is not eternal, then but the Son of God did not begin to be, but simply exists by birth. If their reasoning were well founded, the will would have preceded not only the Son, but the Father, because the cause of the generation is at once in the Father and in the Son. Unbelief follows in all things the inspirations of the flesh. God, to hear

him, did not act other than a man, he deliberated, he reflected carefully before engendering, as if he were subject to the weakness of the human mind, while in God the general is inseparable from the will, as the will is inseparable from the generation; because the will is none other than the generation. We use, it is true, the same terms to say: God did, man did, but the action of God is quite different from the action of man; it is the same in all other circumstances. We always have to talk about God in a way worthy of him. They ask us another question about God the Father: The generation, they ask, has it been for God the Father an accident, or is it of his nature to always beget? They make this question to accuse God, who testifies that He begot Christ, and make Christ not a true son, but a son of adoption. If he has begotten, they say, he must always beget; and as he does not always beget, one must not believe that he has begotten Christ. There would be so much reason to deny that God created the world, because he does not create others. What irreverence, what forgetfulness of all the rules, to lay down laws to God and to say to him: If you have really begotten a Son, you must have spawned many, you have not begotten a single one; that is, they do not believe in the Lord who has declared that he is the only begotten Son of God. After having brought the proofs that show the equality of the Father and the Son, let us see whether the testimonies that Scripture gives to the Holy Spirit agree with these proofs, in order to establish well that the Trinity, of which we profess the belief to be saved, does not admit in the divine persons of distinction of nature, just as it does not admit of difference in the faith which it demands; for although we cannot be saved without one of the three divine persons, it is in all three the same power that saves those who believe in them. We have quoted the words of the Father who bore witness to the Son, let us now produce the words of the Son who bear witness to the Holy Spirit, and who prove that the Holy Spirit is not of a nature different from his. This testimony which the Father gives to the Son and which the Son gives to the Holy Spirit is a demonstrative proof of the unity of nature in the Trinity. Here is what the Lord says: "I will pray to my Father, and He will give you another Comforter, that He may be with you eternally the Spirit of truth." (Jn. 14:16) In promising another Paraclete, he proves that he himself is a Paraclete or advocate. We read in the Epistle of St. John: "We have an advocate with the Father Jesus Christ, who prays for our sins." (1 Jn. 2:1) The Savior says in another place: "I am the truth." This, then, is the clear unity of the Holy Spirit and the Son. The Son attributes to the

Holy Spirit the properties he attributes to himself. Let us now see what the Scriptures provide us with in support of this truth. We read in the prophet Isaiah "that he saw the God of armies seated on a throne of majesty." (Isa. 6:1) and St. John the Evangelist heard these words of Jesus Christ saying, "This is what Isaiah prophesied when he saw his glory and spoke of him." (Jn. 13:41) The Apostle, on his side, declares that it is the Holy Spirit. Here is what he says towards the end of the Acts of the Apostles: "The Holy Spirit speaking to our fathers has said, You shall hear with your ears, and you shall not understand." (Acts 28:26) These words are those of the Lord of hosts. He is the only God; whether one hears either the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, there is no contradiction, because they have only one deity and one power. For if the edict of a single prefect of the courtroom is considered as an order emanating from the other prefects because of the authority and the power which are one, it is much more rightly than under the empire of only one God, if one of the three comes to speak, we say in all truth that the three spoke, for their nature is one as their will. They still seek to diminish the authority of the Holy Spirit by presenting as a sign of inferiority the third place which he occupies, while the divine Scriptures express itself with such simplicity that often the third person is named the first. They are placed according to the circumstances, and in this respect none of them suffers any prejudice, because they have only one and the same divinity. Thus, indeed, the Lord speaks through the mouth of the Lord: "I am the first and I am eternally, it is my hand which founded the earth, it is my right hand which has the heavens." (Isa. 48:12) And a little lower: "I spoke, it was I who called him, who brought him, and I flattened every paths before him. Come near to me and listen to this: From the beginning I did not speak in secret, I was present when these things were resolved, and now I was sent by the Lord God and by his Spirit." (Isa. 48:15-16) Which one do you think the earth has been with? He declares that he was sent. Is it the Father? No. It is therefore the Son who declares himself sent by the Father and by the Holy Spirit. Just as the Holy Spirit was sent by the Father and the Son, so Christ was sent by the Father and by the Holy Spirit. The exclusive privilege of the Father is to be sent by no one. Listen to what the Apostle says and how he enumerates in a different order the people of the Holy Trinity. Here is how he expresses himself in his second Epistle to the Thessalonians: "May the Lord direct your hearts in the love of God and the patience of Jesus Christ." (2 Thess. 3:5) What does he mean here by the Lord, if

not the Holy Spirit? And what is astonishing that he gives to the Holy Spirit the name of Lord of armies that Isaiah gives to him whom he saw sitting on a throne of majesty, as we have said above? The apostle Saint John himself hears of the Holy Spirit when he says of God: "In this we know that God dwells in us because he has made us participate in his Spirit." (1 Jn. 4:13) If it is through his Spirit that he abide in us, there is no doubt that the Holy Spirit is from God, and it is no less certain that what is of God is God. This is what made the Apostle says: "No one knows what is in God except the Spirit of God." (1 Cor. 2:11) But how can he know what is in God unless he has the same divine nature? An inferior nature cannot know what is contained in a superior nature, how much less can a mere creature know what is in its creator? The Apostle, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, reverses the order which the tradition of faith has consecrated and begins with the Holy Spirit the enumeration of the graces and the science of mysteries; He places our Lord Jesus Christ second, and places God the third, God the Father who works, says he, in the Holy Spirit and in the Lord (1 Cor. 12:1) according to this word of the Savior: "My Father, who dwells in me, does the works that I do." (Jn. 14:10) By the same thing that the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ proceed from God the Father, their operation is the work of God. Besides, the same Apostle gives the Holy Spirit the name of Lord and the Lord the name of God because of their unity of nature. Now, having said in such a place that this God, who is the Lord, works all things in all, Saint Paul concludes: "Now it is one and the same spirit that works all these things, distributing to each one his gifts, according to what it pleases." (1 Cor. 12:11) Is it possible to establish more clearly that the three persons have only one operation, because as soon as one acts, the three act with it, as having only the same divinity. It is a certain truth that the gift of graces is the proper work of the Holy Spirit, but to teach us that God, our Lord, and the Holy Spirit are only one because of the identity of nature, the Apostle shows us the work of the Holy Spirit as being common to the three persons. In the same way, to teach us that it is the proper work of the Holy Spirit as a divine person, he adds: and it is one and the same Spirit who operates all these things, distributing his gifts according to what he chooses. He says according to what he pleases, because his will is the very will of God, for he does not say as God wants, but as the Holy Spirit wants. Indeed, the creature strives to do the will of God, while the Holy Spirit naturally wants what God wants. Now, to put this truth in all

its glory, that the Holy Spirit works all these things, Our Lord said to the Jews, "If I cast out demons by the finger of God, etc., " (Luke 9:20) Here he calls the Holy Spirit the finger of God to prove that he is from God. And he does not hesitate to accuse them of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, the Jews who said he was driving out demons by Beelzebub, prince of demons. When Moses himself performed his prodigies by the Holy Spirit, the magicians are obliged to exclaim: "The finger of God is here." (Exod. 8:19) We still read in the Acts of the Apostles: "During that they sacrificed to the Lord and that they loved, the Holy Ghost said to them, Separate Paul and Barnabas for the work to which I have called them." (Acts 13:2) It is to the Lord that they are sacrificed, and the Holy Spirit attributes to himself this act of religion, a clear proof that he is the Lord God, like God the Father, it is Jesus Christ who, from heaven, called Paul and sent him to preach, and the Holy Spirit still attributes to himself this mission in disarray: "For the work to which I have called them," and yet no one is ignorant that it is the Savior who instituted bishops at the head of the churches. It was he who, before ascending to heaven, gave the Apostles pontifical consecration by laying hands on them. However, the Apostle does not fail to attribute this institution to the Holy Spirit when he says: "Be attentive to yourselves and to the flock with which the Holy Spirit has established you bishops to rule the Church of the Lord Jesus." (Acts 20:28) Peter also said to Ananias, " Ananias, why did Satan fill your heart to make you lie to the Holy Spirit?" (Acts 5:3) And he adds, "You have not lied to men, but to God." It is evident that he calls God the Holy Spirit to whom Ananias lied. Had he not wanted to make it known that the Holy Spirit is God, he would have said: You have not lied to men, but to the Holy Spirit, so as not to make the Holy Spirit look like God, not like a man. And what is there in this amazing? The Apostle calls man sometimes the temple of God, sometimes the temple of the Holy Spirit, because they are one by their nature (2 Cor. 6:16; 1 Cor. 6:19); if he would not make us understand that the Holy Spirit is God, how could he say below: "The temple of God is holy, and you are the temple? (1 Cor. 3:17) All the Scriptures teach us the existence of one God, but we worship in the Trinity the mystery of one God. The Scripture thus expresses itself so that in this belief in one God we understand that what proceeds from Him, that is, the Son and the Holy Spirit, deserves the same honors we give to God; for the mystery of God has been revealed to us to make his glory appear in the Trinity. Scripture does not always formally

give the name of God to what proceeds from God so as not to suggest that there is another God apart from the one who is the only God. But it gives us intelligence to lead us to believe that the salvation of men depends on faith in the Trinity, because the three divine persons have the same divinity; for one could not join together and place on the same rank the Creator and the creatures, the Lord and the servants, the eternity and the beings who have a beginning, especially since there is no salvation for any man without faith to one of these three persons. It would be an offense to give the name of God to all that we call God, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, if we give them an honor, a glory other than the honor and glory which are due to an only God. The holy Scriptures thus show that Christ is God, that the Holy Spirit is God, so that those who see him know and understand the nature of what is shown to them. Here is a man who shows a pearl without saying that it is a pearl; will it be a pearl because this man does not say so expressly? Thus the Scriptures show by all the testimonies that we have brought what we must believe, by enclosing our spirits in faith to one God considered in the mystery of the Trinity.

(John 14:9)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 43. WHAT REASONABLE ANSWER CAN ONE MAKE FROM THE LAW TO THE IMPIETY OF THE ARIANS?** — If one must believe in reason, etc. It is therefore evident that Christ is called the true Son of God, as his own Son, that is, born of his substance. This is what makes the Apostle say: "He did not spare his own Son." The very reason for the names of Father and Son teaches us that the Father and the Son share the same nature. Human reason is too weak to reach the knowledge of this mystery. That is why these grand truths have received names which help to conceive the truth of the existence of the Father and the Son. Well, indeed, does not show better that Our Lord Jesus Christ proceeds from God than the name of Son of God given to Him. And as malignity has found a way to misuse these names to give them a meaning different from that which they naturally have, Scripture adds, "He is the true Son," to silence these impious mouths and to those evil spirits. We will even say that no one falls into heresy except by departing from the reason of names; simple and upright minds, which

do not deviate from the meaning of names, remain inviolately attached to the Catholic faith. Simplicity calmly considers what has been taught to it by tradition. When doubts arise, questions arise over truths clearly and simply formulated, and that not satisfied with believing what the words express, men consider it unworthy of them not to add or not to take away something, they fall from the heights of the divine tradition. For the righteous spirits, all their solicitude is that their faith in God is according to tradition. Now, the only meaning of the names of Father and Son leads to the truth of the perfect unity that exists between them. It cannot be supposed that there is a difference between those whom Scripture represents under the same image, and whom the Son himself confirms when he says: "He who sees me, sees my Father." (Jn. 14:9) If, then, he who sees one of them sees them both, the Father and the Son certainly have one and the same form, which can only be so long as the Father and the Son are one and the same substance. And this does not cast doubt on what happens among men, how can one ascertain the existence of the true Son? when the identity of nature is supported by the property of the names of the begotten and the created; for who can generate anything other than himself? If Christ was simply called the Son of God, and the Scripture did not add for greater clarity that He is the true Son of God, to the testimony of the Apostle St. John, "We are in his true Son Jesus Christ, who is the true God and eternal life;" (Jn. 5:20) and St. Paul: "He did not spare his own Son," there might be some doubt as to the meaning of the only name of the Son. But Scripture clearly says that He is the true Son of God; therefore those who go against the natural signification of this expression become their own enemies. They imagine, and under the influence of a false and perverse opinion, they affirm that one must believe something other than what is contained in the reason of faith, as if they wanted to give to God more than him. Even those who believe in him do not want it. If Scripture had not added to the word Son the qualification of truth, we might perhaps doubt. One could say that these words of the Savior: "He who sees me, see my father," signifies that he is like his Father, as milk is like plaster, similar in color, but very different from nature. But, no, as these words are the words of the true Son of God, we must admit that they signify in his mind that the Father and the Son have one and the same nature, and that they do not differ in any way. If indeed the Savior said of the man and the woman, because they have the same nature: "They are no longer two but one flesh," (Matt. 19:6) how much more must one be careful not to say that the

Father and the Son are two, so as not to give rise to the error that their nature is separate, divided, or at least different and dissimilar? Finally, the apostle Saint Paul confirms this unity of nature of the Father and the Son when he says: "He did not look as a usurpation to be equal to God. "(Philip. 2:6) Now, where does this equality come from, if not from the unity of nature, both have one and the same image. The Apostle said, "He did not count equality with God," the Savior Himself called himself the true Son of God, for He could not be equal to God except so much as He proceeded from God: there is no equality possible except between two subjects who are both true or both false. This equality, this unity cannot exist between what had a beginning and what is eternal. So, when Jesus Christ declares that he is one with his Father, he proclaims himself equal to God. "Not only did the Jews reproach him," says the Evangelist, for breaking the Sabbath, but for saying that "God was his Father and to make himself equal to God," that is, to the Father. Is it not obvious that this equality comes from birth? For it is by asserting himself the proper Son, the true Son of God, that he made himself equal to God, and that is why he said: "He who sees me, see my Father," that is, to say that both are of the same nature, the one who sees one sees them both. "For as the Father has life in himself, so has he given to his Son to have life in himself," that is to say, an equal life, etc.

(John 14:27)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 92. HOW SHOULD WE UNDERSTAND THESE WORDS OF THE SAVIOR: "I GIVE YOU MY PEACE, I LEAVE YOU MY PEACE, I DO NOT GIVE IT TO YOU AS THE WORLD GIVES IT?"** — He who receives the peace of the Savior becomes the enemy of the world. If he is not at war with the devil, he will not have peace with Jesus Christ. No one can serve two masters. (Matt. 6:24) He therefore who is at war with the world is one who faithfully observes the law of God, and who, strong in the peace of Jesus Christ, repels all the features of his enemies. Who would dare to undertake against him whom he knows to be the friend of the king? However, the world gives peace otherwise than the Savior promises to give it. The world gives peace out of fear or because it is

asked of it. But the Savior, whose strength has no equal, fears no one, and gives no peace only because he is prayed to. It is the peace of the Savior that he gives us as a bulwark against our enemies. One name serves to express the peace of God and of the world; but what an immense distance separates them! One is fragile, the other is firm; one is carnal, the other is spiritual; this one is terrestrial, that one is celestial; the first is the effect of necessity, the second is all voluntary. Jesus Christ who needs no one offers peace to those who are weak, disarmed; he offers it as the Lord has his subjects, as a good master to bad servants, as God to men. He is therefore right in saying: "I do not give it to you as the world gives it"; By this he brings to light the whole extent of goodness and his mercy. Every man grants peace to be profitable to him; the Savior gives it not in his interest, but in the interest of those who receive it. The world therefore gives peace differently than the Savior gave. And this peace of the world does not teach the holy and pure life, it does not persuade patience, it does not excite the works of justice, it does not exhort to mercy, it does not promise eternal life. He, on the contrary, who has received the peace of Jesus Christ, is far from all the vices of the world which give violent battles to the soul.

### (John 16:8)

#### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 89.** THE SAVIOR SAYS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, THAT WHEN HE COMES HE WILL CONVICT THE WORLD CONCERNING SIN, AND RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND JUDGMENT; SIN, BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT BELIEVED IN ME; JUSTICE, BECAUSE I GO TO MY FATHER, AND YOU WILL SEE ME NO MORE; AND JUDGMENT, BECAUSE THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD IS ALREADY JUDGED. OUR LORD MAKES AN ACCUSATION AGAINST THE WORLD HERE, BUT NEEDS EXPLANATION. — As the Jews did not believe in the Savior, nor the mighty of the world; For it was not only to men that he wanted to manifest himself, but to princes and heavenly powers, as the Apostle teaches in his Epistle to the Ephesians; (Eph 3:10) He predicts that after his passion, the Holy Spirit will show that he has spoken the truth. To convince the world is, therefore, to show him the truth of

things he did not wish to believe. So he refused to believe that he was the Savior sent from God. Now the Savior, after having fulfilled all righteousness, did not hesitate to return to the one who had sent him, and by the very fact that he was returning to heaven, he proved that he had come. "For no one," he says, "goes back to God except the one who descended from God." When the powers saw him ascending into the heavens, they were confounded by seeing the truth of what they had despised as a lie. He therefore gives them the conviction of that righteousness by which he ascends into the heavens from which he descended. He then convinces them of sin, because not only did they not believe in him, but put him to death. He finally convinces them with regard to judgment, by revealing the iniquity of the prince of the world, and his condemnation by him whom they did not believe. Seeing the souls come out of limbo to go to heaven, they knew that the prince of this world was judged, and that, being found guilty of the death of the Savior, he lost all his rights over those whom he held captive. This is what we saw when the Savior ascended to heaven, but what appeared with more brilliance when the Holy Spirit descended on the Apostles. What a more genuine judgment than that pronounced against the world, when after the passion and resurrection of Our Lord, this deceitful world saw the public testimonies which the risen dead, the lame who walked, the healed lepers, delivered to the Savior, the paralyzed, the blind, who saw, the deaf who heard, the mute who spoke, the possessed delivered, the sick who thanked him for having healed them of their infirmities? This is how the Holy Spirit convinced the world by performing these miracles of healing in the name of the Savior who had been reproved by the world.

(John 17:9)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 36. THE SAVIOR SAYS ON ONE SIDE: I PRAY FOR THOSE WHOM YOU HAVE GIVEN ME, I DO NOT PRAY FOR THE WORLD; THE EVANGELIST, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS: WE HAVE AN ADVOCATE NEAR THE FATHER WHO INTERCEDES FOR OUR SINS, AND NOT ONLY FOR OUR SINS, BUT FOR THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD. (1 JN. 2) THESE TWO TEXTS SEEM CONTRADICTORY. —** Although there is not

much difference between these two texts, yet what the Savior says is not what the Apostle St. John asserts. The Savior prays that his disciples be preserved from the attacks of evil. "I ask," he said to his Father, "not that you take them from the world, but that you preserve them from evil." (Jn. 17) The Apostle St. John offers us another kind of prayer: "We have," he says, "an advocate who prays for us sinners, and for the sins of the whole world." Two kinds of prayers are thus formulated for Christians: one asks that their sins be forgiven, and that they be protected from the pursuits of the devil. As for those who have no faith, the only thing that can be asked for them is that instead of inflicting on them the just punishment of their sins, of their unbelief, the goodness and patience of God are waiting for them, their repentance and their conversion. We cannot pray to God, in fact, to forgive sins for those who do not believe; what one can ask for is to give them a long delay, so that their repentance can bring them to remission of their sins. The object of the Savior's prayer is therefore the one we have indicated.

### (John 20:17)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 37. WHY DID THE SAVIOR SAY TO MARY WHEN SHE WANTED TO TOUCH HIM IN THE EXCESSES OF HIS JOY: "DO NOT TOUCH ME, FOR I HAVE NOT YET ASCENDED TO MY FATHER," WHILE WE READ THAT THE OTHER HOLY WOMEN TOUCHED HIM AND WORSHIPED HIM? —** These words, "Do not touch me," are an expression of discontent, and although Mary Magdalene desired to see the Savior, yet while others believed in his resurrection, she continued to stand near the sepulcher shedding tears, whereas she should have rejoiced at the news that the Apostles John and Peter had taught her that the Lord had risen. And indeed we read in the Gospel: "She saw the linen and the shroud placed in one place, and she believed, for she did not yet know the oracles of Scripture which predicted that the Savior should rise again." But Mary did not believe, because she had not seen with her eyes the resurrection of her divine Master. The excess of her love was the cause of her doubt. Are those we love in trials, we can not believe that they can come out of them; for those, on the contrary, whom we hate, would they be two steps from

death, we cannot add to it. Our Lord, therefore, presents himself to Mary, whom her love cast into desolation and sorrow, whereas she should have imitated the faith of the disciples, to console her, but it is not without a certain expression of discontent; that is why he says to her, "Do not touch me," that is to say, you seek a too sensible satisfaction, abstain and rise to the spiritual things that are not seen, because he adds, "I have not yet gone back to my Father." These words have a certain analogy with those of St. John the Baptist sending his disciples to Jesus and saying to them: "Go and say, John the Baptist has sent us to you to ask, Are you the one to come or do we to wait for another?" (Matt. 11; Luke 7) He pleads the cause of his disciples while appearing to speak only in his name. In fact, John could not have the slightest doubt about the person of the Savior, who had said of him: "Here is the Lamb of God, who is the one who takes away the sins of the world." (Jn. 1:29) It is therefore in the interest of his disciples that he sends them to make this request in his name, so that the Savior may confirm with his own mouth what he has taught them of his divine person, and that after his death his disciples follow in the footsteps of Jesus Christ without any hesitation. This is how the Savior in his person reproaches Mary by saying to her: "I have not yet ascended to my Father," that is to say, your heart is still too much attached to the earth, and if you do not see point, you cannot bring yourself to believe. In her, if she had raised her heart to God, she would have believed with the disciples in the resurrection of the Savior.

## ACTS

(Acts 2:1)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 95. WHAT WAS THE ORIGIN OF THE FEAST OF PENTECOST AND THE REASON FOR ITS INSTITUTION?** — It is certain that all the institutions of our religion borrow their strength from the Old Testament, and bear as the seal of the testimony of the old law. Indeed, all the events that took place under the old law were so many figurative signs of our faith, so that we cannot doubt the truth of the teachings that we propose to our belief, when we see them announced so much centuries ago, not only by words, but by the much more powerful language of facts. Now, if we do not have to hear the things figured in the same way as the figurative signs, we now have to consider what is the origin of the feast of Pentecost and the reason for its institution. The divine Scriptures reveal their mysterious meanings to the attentive and religious souls, and keep them closed for careless souls. It was not proper, indeed, that a truth whose intelligence is reserved to those whom their merits render worthy, should be manifested indifferently to all. Here is the reason for the institution of Pentecost. Just as the day of the Lord is the first to begin again the week and the day when the mystery of the Passover was fulfilled for the redemption of the human race (because after a period of seven days we are necessarily returning to the first day of the week, which teaches us that the duration of the world will be consumed by the number seven, and that it will thus reach eternal rest); so Pentecost is the first day after seven weeks. Never does Pentecost fall another day until the day of the Lord, to teach us that all the mysteries which have for their object the salvation of men began and were fulfilled on the Lord's day. It is the day of the Lord that the world was created, just as after the fall, it was the day of Sunday that was repaired, and the figure of this repair was given to us in circumcision which was the sign of future faith. Indeed, after the past week, the eighth day is the first for a mysterious reason. This is the day the Lord has made. He only did this one day, and it was from him that all others should come into being. That is why he was resurrected the day he did, and according to the number we have given reason. It was on this

day that he gave the law of Sinai through his servant Moses, so that the law was the figure of the evangelical preaching, as the paschal lamb had been the figure of the Savior's passion. Indeed, Pentecost, that is to say, the law was given to the Jews the same day that the Holy Spirit descended on the Apostles to assume them with a divine authority, and to give them the knowledge of evangelical preaching. This fact is thus confirmed by a double proof, because it has been predicted and figured, and that the Holy Spirit by this visible manifestation proves the divinity and supernaturality of this event, of which our law receives the most glorious testimony. Uneducated men who issue in various languages before strangers the greatness of God, show that they are divinely inspired. The law was therefore given by Moses to the children of Israel on the third day of the third month, as we read in the book of Exodus (Exod. 19:16), and that day is the fiftieth day or the day of Pentecost since the fourteenth day of the first month Passover was celebrated in Egypt. The Holy Spirit therefore descended on the Apostles on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1), to inaugurate the preaching of the new law, in order to show that the old events were the figures of future events, and thus to give a new pledge of certainty to our faith; for one cannot look upon what was announced from the beginning as false. This is why the psalm fifty describes the time of the remission of sins and reparation, to teach us that the same providence had designated the fiftieth day and the first. That is why the manna again fell from heaven to feed the Jewish people on the first day, which is the day of the Lord, as the following six days prove, during which the Israelites gathered the manna to rest the seventh, that is to say, the Sabbath day. (Exod. 16:14) Now, the manna is the figure of this spiritual food, which after the resurrection of the Lord has become a truth in the mystery of the Eucharist. All these things have been accomplished to return to harmony with the fact of the first resurrection, so that Satan cannot gloat, but he is as stunned, he who by his deceptive hopes has made man fall from the heights where Jesus Christ had placed it. We now have to prove that things must be understood in the way we have exposed them. The fourteenth day of the first month that the Passover was celebrated in Egypt was the fourth day of the week. (Exodus 12:2) What gives us reason to hear it thus, is that the fifteenth day of the second month, which was the day of the departure of the children of Israel, seems to have been the day of the Sabbath, so it was not that day, but the evening only that this cloud of quail was sent to them from heaven. The manna fell from the sky in the

morning, that is to say the day of the Lord who is the first of the week that begins again. They collected the manna six days in a row, and rested on the seventh day, which was the Sabbath day. Now count from this day until the third day of the third month when the law has been given, and you will find that it is the fourth day of the week that the law was given. In fact, from the fifteenth day of the second month, Sabbath day, to the third day of the third month, there are ninety days. Take back the nineteen days, and return to the fifteenth day of the second month, which was the Sabbath day, before which fourteen days are from the first, and go to the first day of the second month, and you will have fourteen more days. Add them to the nineteen days of which we have spoken, and you will find that the first day of the second month was the Sabbath day. Add at the head of the first month seventeen days, because this first month must be cut off from the thirteen days preceding Passover; indeed, it is the fourteenth day of the first month that the Passover was celebrated. By removing thirteen days and adding another seventeen days, you will find that the fourteenth day of the first month was the fourth of the week. And to avoid the boredom of a longer enumeration or the trouble of examining each member of this question in detail, I give you an abridgment here, so that you know for sure how many days have elapsed from the Passover until the day when the law was given, and you can more easily conclude which day of the week the Passover was celebrated. The law was given on the third day after the second month. So here we have two months and three days. Take away from these two months the thirteen days that preceded the feast of Passover, and it will remain fifty days. It is easy to see now that the law was given on the fourth day of the week. The manna fell from the sky on the first day, since the Israelites collected it for six consecutive days, the first day of the week was the sixteenth of the second month. By going from this first day to the eighteenth of the month when the law was given, you will still find the fourth day of the week. Now, if you count on this fourth day, either ascending or descending until the fiftieth, you will fall on the fourth day, and the reason is that the Jews celebrated the Passover in Egypt on the fourth day of the week, that they also received the law on the fourth day, and that they departed from Egypt on the fifth day. The promulgation of the law is therefore the feast of Pentecost.

## ROMANS

(Romans 1:3)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 44.** WE CONFESS THAT THE SAVIOR WAS BORN, HOW COULD THE APOSTLE SAY THAT HE WAS MADE FROM THE RACE OF DAVID (ROM. 1), THAT THERE IS A GREAT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BEING BORN AND MADE? — The expression to be made, can be heard here in the sense of being born. There is no doubt a difference between what is done and what is begotten, but in other matters where there is no question of the flesh and the body. However, it is not without reason that the Apostle used this expression which he still uses in another place: "He was made or formed of a woman," he tells us. (Gal. 4) So it has a special meaning here. The Apostle used it on purpose because the flesh of the Lord was not produced, nor his body formed of a principle from man, but by the operation and virtue of the Holy Spirit. There is indeed a great difference between the formation of the blood, the generation due to the union of the two sexes, and the conception which is the effect of a supernatural power. This is why the Apostle says that he was made rather than born.

(Romans 4:15; 7:12)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 46.** THE APOSTLE CALLS THE LAW GIVEN BY MOSES, A HOLY AND JUST LAW, A GOOD AND SPIRITUAL LAW (ROM. 7:12). ELSEWHERE HE SAID, THE LAW PROVOKES ANGER, AND WHERE THERE IS NO LAW, THERE IS NO TRANSGRESSION (ROM. 4:15). INDEED, THE ABSENCE OF LAW AND TRANSGRESSION IS A CAUSE OF SECURITY. — By carefully comparing these two passages, you could have solved this question yourself, because it is the characteristic of critical minds to raise difficulties by complaining of encountering antilogies, contradictions in the words

of an author who does not offer a trace of it. The Apostle calls the law a holy and just law, good and spiritual; to establish faith, it would suffice for the testimony of this man so worthy of all praise, and leaning everywhere on the truth; and it would only remain to examine without obstinacy and without prevention what seems contradictory in his words. But no, the question that one raises would want to arrive at the liberty of sin. We must therefore remember that the Apostle proposes to establish the superiority of the law of faith under the reign of grace in his epistle to the Romans who, under the guise of the faith of Jesus Christ, had allowed himself to be subjected to the law. This law is not the natural law, for the Romans were subject to this law only ten men sent from Athens, and two others afterwards had brought them; this law was written on two tables which were buried under the ruins of the capitol. St. Paul therefore wants to speak here of the law which is called the law of truths, which commands circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath and the new moons, the distinction of food, the honorable purification of the vessels, and the other observances prescribed by the law: it is from this law that he says that he produces anger, for God, angry with his people, added these prescriptions to be like a heavy burden to the infidelity of the Jews; in fact it was almost impossible not to transgress any of these laws so multiplied. This is what made the apostle St. Peter say: "Why do we want to impose on our brothers a yoke that neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?" (Acts 15) God also says through his prophet Jeremiah, "I gave them imperfect precepts." (Ezek. 20) After their multiplied offenses, their repeated murmurs against God, which they continually tempted, and their outrages upon Moses, he imposed on them these precepts, the observation of which must weigh on their head so hard, for on whatever side they might turn, they met the law which left them no rest, and to deliver them from this law, the Apostle says to them, "Where there is no law, there is no transgression," so that they may safely serve God spiritually in a shorter way, wanting to observe the law of the Jews he said to them, it is necessary that you should become the prevaricators, for the precepts are so numerous and so difficult that it is impossible to fulfill them, and the Apostle would not speak so in speaking of the natural law because Moses only wrote for to affirm the authority of this law, not that it did not exist before, since we see that before Moses the transgression was punished. The Apostle therefore wished to teach the Romans that they should no longer live under the law, because their interest made them a duty to practice

the law. Indeed, there was no other way for them to observe justice. This is what the Apostle tells them in another place: "Do you want to have no fear of power? Do good," and again: "Those who resist, draw on them damnation." (Rom. 13:2) He therefore calls spiritual this law which he showed holiness, justice and goodness. This is the law that we call natural who defends sin, and who is given to us as a guide in the way of good. The law of faith which is added to this law makes the man perfect. As the name of law is a generic name, the Apostle here seems to speak against the law, but to establish that he does not want to destroy this law which gives the necessary direction to our lives, he says, "We know that the law is spiritual," to see thus that the law which he fights is the law of the sabbath, circumcision, food, and new moons, the first is called spiritual because it punishes all sins.

#### (Romans 8:7)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 47. WHY IS THE WISDOM OF THE FLESH AN ENEMY OF GOD, OR WHAT IS THIS WISDOM WHICH IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW OF GOD?** — This question, as to the meaning, does not differ from the preceding one in which we have explained what St. Paul means by the flesh; we can therefore know more easily what is the wisdom of the flesh. We have said that the name of flesh is given to all elements, it is to all visible beings who have the principle that nothing can be done without a mixture of simple substances and which have a horror and treat of madness the reason and the action of power. In fact, those who do not believe in spiritual things and follow the inspirations of the flesh do not esteem and admit as true that which is contained in the nature of the elements. Thus they refuse to believe in the virgin birth, in the resurrection of the flesh, because the nature of the flesh, that is, of the elements, does not admit such phenomena. In fact, all the beings that are begotten in time are only by the effect of the mixture of different substances, and the bodies once dead and fallen into dissolution cannot be restored to life, for every element under of dissolution, resumes its own nature. Swollen with these vain prejudices, they openly deny what we believe we have already done, or have to make, and by the same their affirmations are enemies of

God, because they treat with madness and lies what God has made and promised to do.

## 1 CORINTHIANS

(**1 Corinthians 5:5**)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 49.** WHAT IS THIS SPIRIT OF WHICH THE APOSTLE AFFIRMS AND DESIRES SALVATION WHEN HE SAYS: "I GAVE HIM UP TO SATAN FOR THE DEATH OF THE FLESH, THAT HIS SPIRIT MAY BE SAVED, ETC."? — The death of the flesh takes place when one gives oneself to the pleasures and desires of the flesh, and thus makes oneself worthy of hell, for one thus buys death at the price of the works of the flesh. Through these works man becomes carnal; for just as by living in the law he becomes all spiritual until then, when he participates in spirituality and takes the name of the soul; thus living according to the desires of the world and guilty pleasures, he becomes wholly carnal in all his being and tends entirely towards the death of the flesh. And to explain this truth even more clearly, just as the flesh that is fragile, corruptible and mortal, losing the soul loses all its beauty and all its form and dies, because to die for it is to lose what gave the life to all its members; thus the soul loses all its beauty and all its form in contact with that body whose vigor has despised the soul united to the flesh and plunged it into all the defilements of vice. Far, therefore, that the soul can be of no use to the flesh, the flesh becomes for the soul a cause of death, because the soul which God had given as queen to the flesh did not govern the body spiritually, but taught him to do the works of the flesh. So when the

Church rejects such a man from within, she keeps the spirit, that is, the Holy Spirit who is the protector of the Church, for if they had suffered in the midst of this man who dared to defile the wife of his father, because they had the design to arm himself against the law to preserve others from his contact, and that this crime forces the Holy Spirit to withdraw from the Church, we can no longer say that the Church has preserved the Spirit. In fact, one does not keep what one loses, and when in the day of the Lord they appear to be stripped of the Spirit, they cannot be admitted to the number of the children of God, for it is the Spirit who makes us bear witness that we are the children of God. The Apostle addresses himself here to the people, because not all the churches had bishops yet. He therefore commands the faithful to do what the bishop would do if he were at their head, that is to say, to unite all to reject him from the bosom of the Church and not appear to be accomplices of his crime. He who does not take back a culprit, when he can, but who welcomes him as if he were innocent, increases for him the ease of sinning, and by the same defiles his soul and puts to flight the Holy Spirit. St. Paul writing to the Thessalonians said to them in the same sense: "May your spirit, your soul, and your body be kept intact and undefiled for the coming of Our Lord." (1 Thess. 5:23) This is the same meaning, since to be kept safe and to be intact means one and the same thing. So the king said to Daniel, "Are the seals safe?" (Dan. 14:16), Daniel answers him, "Yes, king, they are safe," that is to say, "intact." So the Spirit is intact for us, when it does not abandon us. Those whom the Holy Spirit abandons, are no longer intact for the work of regeneration, because they no longer have in them the one that gave them to be called God's children. There is no contradiction in saying that the Holy Spirit abandons us when we sin, and that he is no longer intact or whole. We are abandoned by the one who was our guide and our master, for if he is our leader we are his members, and when we do an action which displeases him, he is not the one who abandons us, it is we who abandons him, and then he seems to be no longer intact and whole in losing us. It is an obvious truth that he is not the one who walks away from us, but we who walks away from him when we sin. The Apostle in his Epistle to the Colossians said to them, "Whose whole body is supported by his bonds and by his joints, converses and increases for the increase of the Lord God." (Col. 2:19) These words if we hear them in their literal sense, they do not seem to be admissible, for there is no void in God which we are called to fill, but when we return to the author of our life, and

confess that he is our God he seems to acquire us for salvation, and his divinity take in us from increase in our soul, while it undergoes a real decrease in those who are departing from him and undergo a decrease are therefore two synonymous expressions.

### (1 Corinthians 5:7)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 96. SHOULD WE INTERPRET THE WORD PASSOVER IN THE SENSE OF THE PASSING OVER, AS THE GREEKS EXPLAIN?** — The apostle could not be mistaken when he said: "Jesus Christ, our paschal lamb, was slain for us." (1 Cor. 5:7) And this is not his doctrine here, but that of the law, in which Moses said to the Israelites, "When your children ask you, What is this ceremony? You will answer: It is the sacrifice of the Passover of the Lord." What more is needed to establish the truth that occupies us? The law speaks, the Apostle gives proof, it remains only to repel the contraditors if they persevere in their stubbornness. It is obvious, indeed, that the passing over took place after the Passover. And they took of the blood of the lamb that was slain, and put it on the one and on the other, and on the tops of their houses so that the angel who was to pass during the night should spare the houses which would be marked with the blood of the lamb. It is therefore the blood that saved them, not the passing, for it is the blood that has opposed the passing to become deadly and fatal.

### (1 Corinthians 6:8)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 50. THERE IS A GREAT NUMBER OF SINS WHOSE BODY IS THE OBJECT, FOR EVERY MAN WHO COMMITS AN ACT OF VIOLENCE ON ANY PART OF HIS BODY, SIN AGAINST HIS BODY. THUS THIS ONE MUTILATES HIMSELF, THAT ONE HANGS HIMSELF, THIS OTHER PLUNGES A DAGGER INTO THE BREAST. WHY THEN DOES THE**

APOSTLE SAY, "EVERY SIN THAT MAN COMMITS IS OUTSIDE HIS BODY, BUT HE WHO GIVES HIMSELF UP TO FORNICATION SINS AGAINST HIS BODY?" — Do you want to accuse the Apostle of ignorance, or do you simply want the explanation of these words? Saint Paul under the name of body, includes not only the man but the woman, because the woman is a part of the man. Now, all these crimes of which we speak above, that is to say those acts of violence to which we are against ourselves, do not defile the whole body, because the man sins alone, and by the same becomes guilty only. In fornication, on the contrary, the defilement extends to the whole body, because the consent to the crime is at the same time the fact of the man and the woman, that is why the fornication is a crime so serious, because it is pushing the sin until the excess, than to seek an accomplice to his crime. If the virtuous man receives the reward due to the one he has won for good, and if the vicious man is not only punished for himself, but for the one he associates with his condemnation, how much more who commits fornication, and who by one sin imprints upon himself, so to speak, a double defilement? Indeed, as soon as he sinned against the flesh that comes from him, he dishonors himself by a double adultery. If we wish to give another explanation of this question, by applying these words either to the Church or to the body of Jesus Christ, this interpretation cannot be admitted. It is to violently divert the meaning of these words and to resemble Novatian who, to defend his extravagances, claims that the one who commits fornication, does not sin against his body, but against the body of Jesus Christ, because Christians are the body of Jesus Christ, that is, fornication is the same as sacrilege, and he who is guilty of it sin against Jesus Christ as he who denies Jesus Christ. Now, nothing weaker and more fragile than this interpretation, on whatever side it turns, it falls into difficulties that it is impossible for it to avoid. Indeed, if the Lord sins against the body of Jesus Christ, the other sins will no longer be offenses against Jesus Christ. For example, the crime of a Christian who kills his brother, sacrificed to idols, or is guilty of some other sin, because all sin is outside the body, except fornication. If, on the contrary, all sin is not outside the body, but all without exception, are so many direct offenses against Jesus Christ, it must be said that the thief, the perjurer, the liar, the one who strikes his brother, or commits some other similar crime, sins against Jesus Christ or against the Holy Spirit, which is supremely absurd, and yet the Apostle calls the members of the Church the body of Jesus Christ, and we are

members of each other. How, then, does the fornicator sin against his body, and not against the body of Jesus Christ? Because it is from the mystery of the formation of the Church that we are called not our body, but the body of Jesus Christ. This explanation is further removed from the question we are dealing with, because the fornicator sins against his body, because Adam is defiled by this sin.

(**1 Corinthians 9:22**)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 51. WHY DOES THE APOSTLE SAY THAT HE HAS BECOME ALL THINGS TO EVERYONE, WHICH SEEMS TO BE THE FAULT OF A FANATIC AND A HYPOCRITE?** — The adversary gives his approval not to oppose the one whom he wishes to render favorable. He who, to avoid scandal, does something which has no danger, it is true, but which is also useless, desires the salvation of him to whom he will spare scandal. When the Apostle St. Paul circumcised his disciple Timothy, who had caused the Jews, and purified himself before entering the temple, he did so not to scandalize those who defended with exceeding zeal the traditions of their fathers, and who could have put him to death or looked at our religion as being directly opposed to them. He therefore consented to submit to a less important observance to earn more. He might have exposed himself to a grave fault by not going as a Jew in the temple to pray; he therefore submitted in their interest to this prescription. He also lent himself to the way of seeing of those who were under the law, that is, Samaritans, in that they admitted that the books of Moses came from God, and that circumcision and the Sabbath were also divine institutions. It was by means of these books that he proved to them that the Christ whom they hoped for was the one whom he preached to them. This is what the Samaritan woman utters when she says to the Lord: "I know that the Messiah must come, when he comes, he will tell us all things. (Jn. 4:25) It is according to this principle and in this sense that the Apostle went through all the books of Moses who said, "The Lord your God will raise up a prophet from among your brethren." (Deut. 18:15) Saint Paul is still made to those who were under the law, in this respect that they recognize that the world and the human race have God as author. This is why he says to them: As some of your poets have said: We are

the children of God himself. (Acts 17:28) This is how he made himself all for the sake of their salvation.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
(1 Corinthians 10:13)	(1 Corinthians 10:13)
<p><b>QUESTION 99. WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF THE APOSTLE MEAN: "LET ONLY HUMAN TEMPTATIONS COME TO YOU?"</b></p> <p>— It is not without a providential purpose that the Apostle, Doctor of the Nations, expresses the wish that only human temptations should occur to us; because divine temptation can become mortal. It was because of this temptation that the Jews who lived under the law of God were victims of the bites of snakes. This is why the Apostle tells us: "Do not be surprised by a divine temptation, but simply be human." A man is said to be subject to divine temptation, while acting in the name of God. from God, he hopes for his salvation from idols, because he does not hold God to the test. For all that is not tried is tempted, and what is tempted becomes doubtful. This is why divine temptation is mortal, while human temptation is salutary; for if it is dangerous to doubt God, it is even more useful not to put one's hope in man, to remain faithful to the law of God. It is therefore in a spirit of high wisdom that the Apostle tells us: "Let only human temptations come to you." He wants that when men try our</p>	<p><b>QUESTION 52. WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF THE APOSTLE MEAN: "THAT ONLY TEMPTATIONS OF HUMANITY COME TO YOU?"</b></p> <p>DOES NOT HE SEEM TO DESIRE THIS TEMPTATION FOR THEM? AND WHAT ARE THESE HUMAN TEMPTATIONS? SO THERE ARE ALSO DIVINE TEMPTATIONS. THEREFORE, THEY MUST BE DISCERNED, AND HE MAKES THE DIFFERENCE HERE. — Any question requires to be well informed to be brought back to its principle. The Apostle complaining of the infidelity of the Jews, who had tempted God in solitude, said to the faithful of Corinth, "Let us not tempt Jesus Christ, as some of them tempted." (1 Corinthians 10:9) He reminds them of the infidelity of the Jews and the punishments with which they were followed, to inspire them with a salutary fear, and to turn us away by this example of their perversity, of the divine temptation which he has shown us and to urge to flee above all else. There is divine temptation when a man living under the law of God does not leave in a feeling of defiance to ask for help from idols. He therefore urges us to let</p>

fidelity to the law of God, they find us strong and unshakable, and that while the carnal men doubt our fidelity, we pass as tested in the eyes of God, because those who are not tested before him, he tempts them to make them better. There is therefore a double temptation, we are tempted sometimes as faithful, sometimes as if overcome by defiance. The temptation of the faithful is a human temptation. For we are then tested by men for the cause of faith; they tempt us to make us renounce the faith. The temptations caused by defiance are meant to bring men back into the way of God through suffering and repentance, as happened to the Jews. They no longer had trust in God's providence, they were tempted by snakes, so that suffering inspired them with more just feelings. There is another temptation to which Abraham, Job, and Tobias, these great servants of God, have been subjected: Abraham, by the sacrifice which must have been so painful to him of his only and beloved son, reaped abundant fruits of justice for eternal glory (Gen. 22:1); Job saw the success of the loss of all his goods much greater riches for the earth and for heaven (Job 1-2); lastly, the loss of sight was so advantageous to Tobias, that it was followed by a glorious cure for him on earth, with the hope of eternal brightness for the future life. (Tobit 2:11) The righteous are therefore tested only for their advancement. This is why we must show in the

ourselves be surprised only by human temptations. Now, a human temptation is that which inspires us with the defiance of man for the cause of God, and makes us eagerly welcome the inspirations of faith. This temptation is a defiance that prevents us from defying ourselves from the promises of God. This temptation belongs to mankind, because in every error that seduces us there is a human temptation that declares itself against the law of God by opposing it with worldly reasons, and wants us to lose confidence in God's promises. So you see clearly what God's temptation and human temptation are to be kept from neglecting if we are engaged in the faith of God.

temptations of great courage, in the conviction that we are far from doing harm they can only be useful if we support them patiently with the grace of Jesus Christ.

**(1 Corinthians 12:3)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 53.** WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THESE WORDS OF THE APOSTLE: "NO ONE CAN SAY JESUS IS THE LORD, EXCEPT BY THE HOLY SPIRIT?" SO PHOTIN, WHO DENIES THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST, CAN CONFESS IN THE HOLY SPIRIT THAT JESUS IS THE LORD; MARCION AND MANICHEA, WHO DENY THE INCARNATION OF CHRIST, WILL ALSO BE ABLE TO SAY THAT JESUS CHRIST IS THE LORD, AND SO ARE WOMEN OF BAD LIFE AND FILTHINESS, WHEREAS THE HOLY SPIRIT DOES NOT DWELL IN A SUBMISSIVE BODY TO SIN, AND THAT WISDOM DOES NOT ENTER A SOUL THAT WANTS EVIL. (WIS. 1:4) — It is not according to persons that we must judge the truth or the falsity of an assertion. All that is in conformity with the good and the truth is said without doubt by the Holy Spirit. That a man is reprehensible on other points is not a reason to refuse to believe him when he speaks the truth. It is not him when we refuse to believe, but our Lord Jesus Christ is contradicted. By arguing that he does not speak the truth, it is Jesus Christ who is insulted. If, indeed, this man speaks the truth, and it is denied that he has said by the Holy Spirit that truth which Jesus Christ approves (for no good man can condemn him who says of him what is true, and it is not by revelation that we learn what tradition teaches us), no one can be condemned by telling the truth.

## 2 CORINTHIANS

**(2 Corinthians 5:14-15)**

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 54.** THE APOSTLE TEACHES THAT JESUS CHRIST DIED FOR ALL MEN. "ALL ARE THEREFORE DEAD," SAID HE, "AND HE DIED FOR ALL." THE SAVIOR SAYS, ON THE CONTRARY: THE SON OF MAN HAS COME TO GIVE HIS LIFE FOR THE REDEMPTION OF MANY. (MATT 20:28) THERE IS HERE A CONTRADICTION. — The words are different, it is true, but the meaning is the same; at other times, on the other hand, words that seem the same have quite a different meaning, such as these: "All that is not done in good faith (*ex fide*) is a sin." (Rom. 14:23) and these others: "The law does not come from faith," (Gal. 3:12) although the law is not a sin. This great number of which the Savior speaks is all the men of whom St. Paul speaks: They are in great numbers, because the greater part of all peoples and all nations ought to believe in the Savior. It is this great number of those who must believe that the Apostle calls all men. "He is dead for all," he says, "that is, for those who believe and must believe." He died also for those who refused to believe, but by refusing the grace he offers them, they do not want Jesus Christ to be dead for them, and by the same he seems not to have died for those to that his death was much more harmful than useful. On the contrary, he truly died for those who won, and who understand the mystery of the redemption give thanks to God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
<b>(2 Corinthians 5:21; Isaiah 53:9)</b>  <b>QUESTION 74.</b> HOW TO RECONCILE THESE WORDS OF THE PROPHET ISAIAH SPEAKING OF CHRIST: "HE DID NOT COMMIT SIN," (ISAIAH 53:9)	<b>(2 Corinthians 5:21; Isaiah 53:9)</b>  <b>QUESTION 40.</b> HOW TO RECONCILE THESE WORDS OF THE PROPHET ISAIAH SPEAKING OF CHRIST: "HE DID NOT COMMIT SIN," (ISAIAH 53:9)

WITH THESE OTHERS OF THE APOSTLE: "HE WAS MADE SIN FOR US WHO KNEW NO SIN?" (2 COR. 5:21) — As to meaning, there are two different questions here; but the expressions which appear similar are partly similar, partly different; he did, and he did not do so are two contradictory terms; he did not know and he did not do so are two similar phrases. The Prophet, speaking of the person of Christ, therefore says that he has not committed sin, and that lies have not been found on his lips. The Apostle, on the other hand, speaks of the person of the Father who made sin for us Christ who did not know sin. What to hear in two ways. First he made sin when he resolved his incarnation and decreed that he who was not subject to this condition would take a body of sinful flesh, and thus it was sinned. He made it sin again by offering it for our sins, for the victim offered under the law for sins took the name of sin. Jesus Christ, therefore, did not know sin, as the Prophet declares, but his Father has made him sin, as we have shown. To offer Christ for us, is it not to give all power to those who want to put him to death? Now, why was this power granted to them, it is in our interest, so that Christ could descend to hell and strip it of the souls it held captive. It is an enormous sin, unheard of, to have put to death the one who not only was guilty of no sin, but who had restored life to so many; it is from this sin that the devil has

WITH THESE OTHERS OF THE APOSTLE: "HE WHO DID NOT KNOW SIN, HE WAS MADE SIN FOR US." (2 COR. 5:21) — As to meaning, there are two different questions here; but the expressions which appear similar are partly similar, partly different; he did, and he did not do so are two contradictory terms; he did not know and he did not do so are two similar phrases. The Prophet, speaking of the person of Christ, therefore says that he has not committed sin, and that lies have not been found on his lips. The Apostle, on the other hand, speaks of the person of the Father who made sin for us Christ who did not know sin. What to hear in two ways. First he made sin when he resolved his incarnation and decreed that he who was not subject to this condition would take a body of sinful flesh, and thus it was sinned. He made it sin again by offering it for our sins, for the victim offered under the law for sins took the name of sin. Jesus Christ, therefore, did not know sin, as the Prophet declares, but his Father has made him sin, as we have shown. To offer Christ for us, is it not to give all power to those who want to put him to death? Now, why was this power granted to them, it is in our interest, so that Christ could descend to hell and strip it of the souls it held captive. It is an enormous sin, unheard of, to have put to death the one who not only was guilty of no sin, but who had restored life to so many; it is from this sin that

been guilty, and he has thereby lost his power of proud opposition. We read something similar in the Galatian epistle: "It was made for us curse," says St. Paul. (Gal. 3:13) Now who made him a curse, if not the Father? For it is by an effect of God's judgment that the cross of Jesus Christ is the curse of the Jews, and the death of the Savior highly proclaims their sin. He therefore wanted to be crucified, so that his passion might be useful to us, and that those who would come out of this life with the sign of the Savior would be free from the tyranny of the second death; for death dreads even the servants of him who triumphed over it. In this question not only the words, but the people are different. He did and he did not do it are two contradictory terms; but as the action claimed to have been made has not been done by the person who has been denied, it cannot be said that there is a contradiction. The words of the prophet apply to the person of Christ, those of the Apostle to the person of the Father. In fact, God the Father has reconciled the world through Jesus Christ, and this is how he has made Christ to be sin. He therefore made him sin, by bringing down into the bosom of a virgin to be born man, he who by his nature was not subject to a human birth, and thus he was made sin of the side of the flesh which is a flesh of sin. He was born to be offered as a victim for fishermen. Thus the Apostle says that he was made sin, because

the devil has been guilty, and he has thereby lost his power of proud opposition. We read something similar in the Galatian epistle: "It was made for us curse," says St. Paul. (Gal. 3:13) Now who made him a curse, if not the Father? For it is by an effect of God's judgment that the cross of Jesus Christ is the curse of the Jews, and the death of the Savior highly proclaims their sin. He therefore wanted to be crucified, so that his passion might be useful to us, and that those who would come out of this life with the sign of the Savior would be free from the tyranny of the second death; for death dreads even the servants of him who triumphed over it. In this question not only the words, but the people are different. He did and he did not do it are two contradictory terms; but as the action claimed to have been made has not been done by the person who has been denied, it cannot be said that there is a contradiction. The words of the prophet apply to the person of Christ, those of the Apostle to the person of the Father. In fact, God the Father has reconciled the world through Jesus Christ, and this is how he has made Christ to be sin. He therefore made him sin, by bringing down into the bosom of a virgin to be born man, he who by his nature was not subject to a human birth, and thus he was made sin of the side of the flesh which is a flesh of sin. He was born to be offered as a victim for fishermen. Thus the Apostle says that he was

according to the law the victim who was offered for sins took the name of sin. We read something similar in the epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians. He says in speaking of the Savior, "He was made a curse for us," (Gal. 3:13) which words here are the meaning: God the Father did it for us, sin or curse, allowing the Jews to put Him to death, so that their unbelief, because of their disapproval, gives us place to take their place according to what the Savior said: "The kingdom of God will be taken away from you, and it will be given to a people who will bear the fruits." (Matt. 21:43) In the language of Scripture God is supposed to do what he allows, because something is done only because he allows it. So our Lord said to Pilate, "You shall have no power over me, unless it be given you from above." (Jn. 19:11) It is not by sending it from heaven, but by allowing the use of power that God gives it, and the perverse soul that receives the power to do what it wants becomes guilty, like the Jews who by putting to death the Savior made him their curse, by a just judgment of God. Indeed, the Savior's cross was the curse of the Jews. The sacrilege that was offered on the cross did not purify the one who offered it as the victim sacrificed for sins; on the contrary, the Savior in this sacrifice has become the sin that defiles the soul of those who offered it, and the justification of those who lived far from him, so that the blessing promised to Abraham may be

made sin, because according to the law the victim who was offered for sins took the name of sin. We read something similar in the epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians. He says in speaking of the Savior, "He was made a curse for us," (Gal. 3:13) which words here are the meaning: God the Father did it for us, sin or curse, allowing the Jews to put Him to death, so that their unbelief, because of their disapproval, gives us place to take their place according to what the Savior said: "The kingdom of God will be taken away from you, and it will be given to a people who will bear the fruits." (Matt. 21:43) In the language of Scripture God is supposed to do what he allows, because something is done only because he allows it. So our Lord said to Pilate, "You shall have no power over me, unless it be given you from above." (Jn. 19:11) It is not by sending it from heaven, but by allowing the use of power that God gives it, and the perverse soul that receives the power to do what it wants becomes guilty, like the Jews who by putting to death the Savior made him their curse, by a just judgment of God. Indeed, the Savior's cross was the curse of the Jews. The sacrilege that was offered on the cross did not purify the one who offered it as the victim sacrificed for sins; on the contrary, the Savior in this sacrifice has become the sin that defiles the soul of those who offered it, and the justification of those who lived far from him, so that the

repaired among the nations. Indeed the sacrifice of the Jews benefited the Gentiles, who did not hesitate to embrace the faith of Jesus Christ.

blessing promised to Abraham may be repaired among the nations. Indeed the sacrifice of the Jews benefited the Gentiles, who did not hesitate to embrace the faith of Jesus Christ.

## GALATIANS

(**Galatians 2:11, 14**)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 55.** WHY DOES THE APOSTLE ST. PAUL TAKE UP PETER HIS COLLEAGUE IN THE APOSTOLATE THAT, OUT OF FEAR OF THE CIRCUMCISED JEWS, HE WAS SEPARATING FROM THE GENTILES, WHILE HE HIMSELF, OUT OF FEAR ALSO OF THOSE WHO WERE CIRCUMCISED, THOUGHT HE OUGHT TO CIRCUMCISE TIMOTHY, AGAINST THE DEFENSE HE HIMSELF MADE TO RECEIVE CIRCUMCISION? HE IS THEREFORE REPREHENSIBLE. (ACTS 16:3) — It is quite incredible that such a great apostle has taken in another a fault to which he would have succumbed himself. It is not allowed to believe that such a great man has fallen into a contradiction which is proper only to those who live according to the flesh. The action of the Apostle St. Paul is therefore nothing reprehensible. He taught, it is true, that one should not be circumcised, but as he wanted to take with him Timothy who was born of a Jewish mother and a kind father, and that the Jews were scandalized that he would add a man born of a Jewish mother without being circumcised, he submitted for the moment to this observance and circumcised Timothy. So he did something useless with the consent of that he who was the object. As his mother was Jewish, and from his childhood he had applied himself in the synagogue to the study of the holy letters, that is to say the books of the Hebrews, he consented to be circumcised to remove any occasion of scandal to the Jews who were zealous for all that was due to the privileges of their race. "As for Titus, who was kind, he was not obliged, he said, to be circumcised. But for Timothy, who was born of a Jewish mother, as I have said, the Jews would not suffer that he should rank among the doctors without being circumcised. The Apostle had taken him with him to give him episcopal consecration, which he did indeed. His profound knowledge of prophecies gave him the means to preach Jesus Christ fruitfully. Now the Apostle St. Peter would not have been taken back, if according to the custom of the Jews he had simply separated from the Gentiles not to scandalize the Jews. Now, what the Apostle St. Paul assumes in him, is that in

the presence of the Gentiles converted to the faith he ate with them and like them, whereas after the arrival of the Jews whom St. James had sent he feared the circumcised, and taught that Gentiles converted to the faith should Judaize. This is St. Paul's reproach: "If you are Jewish, live like the Gentiles; why are you compelling the Gentiles to Judaize?" This led to the questioning of the Gospel doctrine, which was an evil, since it erected with one hand and destroyed the other. The apostle Saint Paul calls a dissimulation, and if he thought it his duty to circumcise Timothy, he made known that he submitted to a useless observance not to scandalize the Jews, and that he yielded to them because Timothy had a Jewish mother, because it was the only motive of the Jewish authorities, for they could in no way condemn that Gentiles do not circumcise or be scandalized by this abstaining on the part of those which was not of the race of Israel, but not by dissimulation, but by yielding to force, that St. Paul acted in this circumstance. On the contrary, Peter's conduct was an act of concealment in the first place, because a large number surrendered guilty of this suppression, and several Jews, and Barnabas himself allowed themselves to be carried away.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT <b>(Galatians 2:15)</b>	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT <b>(Galatians 2:15)</b>
<b>QUESTION 81.</b> THE APOSTLE, SAYS, "WE ARE THE JEWS OF OUR BIRTH," WANTS TO SHOW THAT THE JEWS DERIVE THEIR BIRTH FROM THE JEWS, AND I DO NOT SPEAK HERE OF THE PROSLEYTES WHO BECOME JEWS. SO THOSE BORN IN THE DESERT WERE NOT CIRCUMCISED, YET THEY WERE JEWS. IT IS NOT CIRCUMCISION THAT MAKES THE JEW, BUT THE BIRTH OF PARENTS FAITHFUL TO THE RELIGION OF A CREATOR GOD. IF, THEN, JEWS	<b>QUESTION 56.</b> THE APOSTLE SAYS, "WE ARE JEWS BY OUR BIRTH." ACCORDING TO HIM, JEWS ARE BORN OF JEWS? BUT THOSE BORN IN THE DESERT WERE NOT CIRCUMCISED JEWS. IT IS NOT CIRCUMCISION THAT MAKES THE JEW, BUT THE BIRTH THAT TAKES PLACE UNDER THE RELIGION OF A CREATOR GOD. IF, THEREFORE, JEWS ARE BORN OF JEWS, AND PAGANS OF PAGANS, CHRISTIANS MUST ALSO BE BORN CHRISTIANS. — All that is

**ARE BORN OF THE JEWS, WHY ARE NOT CHRISTIANS ALSO BORN OF CHRISTIANS, JUST AS PAGANS ARE BORN PAGANS? —**

All that is born is not of the same nature as that which gives birth to it. Thus gold is born from the earth without being earth itself, so is the food that comes from the wood, the little bird that is born from the egg. Now, if Gentiles are born of the Gentiles, here is the reason: every pagan is in ignorance, and he who is born having no true idea, both are ignorant. There is, however, this difference between them, that the one who gives birth is undoubtedly a blasphemer, and thereby even a child of the devil; while the child who has just been born can neither blaspheme nor bless, yet he is pagan because he has no understanding of the truth. The Jew is born of a Jew because he owes the day to his parents who are faithful to the worship of the Creator God. This is what Adam said at the birth of Cain: "I have begotten a man by the grace of God." (Gen. 4:1) Just as pagans without religion for the Creator give thanks to the devil in all the events of their lives, so the Jews who worship the Creator God praise Him in all their deeds, they are blameworthy only not to recognize Christ by whom all things exist. (Jn. 1:3) The Jew is born of Jewish parents in this way. It is not, as some think, that circumcision is the Jew. Circumcision is the sign of Judaism and not Judaism, just as the

born is not of the same nature as that which gives birth to it. So gold, etc. There is, however, the pagan who is without intelligence, and who has no merit either by himself or by another. Now the Jew is born of a Jew, and so on. But this is what is objected to: If the one who begets has become what he is, he must engender a being like himself, in order to ensure the transmission of the dignity with which he is clothed, as he has done for the Jews; for Abraham, idolatrous as he was, became a servant of the true God, and it is from him that the Jews have their origin, just as those who become senators in turn create senators. But the dignity of the senators has no merit in the eyes of God, this dignity is attached neither to nature nor to substance, it consists entirely in the fame and appreciation of men, and this appreciation is transmitted by the generation, but the dignity it gives exists only in opinion. We said why Jews are born Jews. As for the Christian, his nature, his substance, his whole being, participate in the dignity he receives, it is not only a mere presumption, it is an actual reality before God. Let us add that by the remission of sins man is completely purified and becomes the adopted son of God. It is therefore necessary that all who are born be subject to this second birth, because the mercy of God gives each one grace. One cannot receive for others the remission of sins. The soul that is born in the body

circumcision of Abraham was not justice for him, but the sign of righteousness, so that those who were born of Abraham would bear the characteristic sign as children of Abraham. It is from Judas Maccabee that the Jews derive their name, and not only the inhabitants of the tribe of Judah, but all the other children of Jacob are called Jews (*Judæi*) because Judas was their leader; and that is why the Jews receive at their birth a sign which makes them recognize. For the Christian, on the contrary, he is not born of a Christian, because whoever gives him birth is not born, but has become a Christian. He who is born of him must also become if he wants to be; for he is not born Christian by virtue of his nature, he becomes so by the faith which is given him after his birth. Ignorance is the companion of carnal birth, the spiritual gift of faith is given only afterwards. But this is what is objected to: If the one who begets has become a Christian, he must transmit through the generation what he is to perpetuate the dignity with which he is clothed. That is how senators give birth to senators. I answer that the dignity of senator is without merit in the eyes of God. It is not to nature, that is, to the substance of man, that this dignity is attached, it is entirely in the fame and appreciation of men. This appreciation is transmitted by the generation, but the dignity it gives exists only in public opinion, so that the consuls, or those to

or with the body, subject to the death of which Adam was the cause, cannot avoid the torment of hell if it bears the sign of the victory it has won over death. Everyone receives this benefit for himself, and not for him who does not yet exist. If the one who becomes a Christian immediately came into possession of immortality, the child born of him would be like the one who gives him birth. Those who become Christians, receive the sign that frees them from the second death, yet they cannot escape the present death, following the sin of Adam. Now, children are baptized, innocent as they are, so that their soul without experience who is born with the body bears the sign of his victory over death, who loses his rights over it. Abraham and the prophets have no sign, because the time has not yet arrived; it was reserved for the Son of God who came to triumph over death to spread this grace in the souls of believers. This is why Our Lord said to the Jews: "Abraham, your father, desired to see my day, he saw it, and rejoiced in it." Abraham knew, indeed, that Christ had been promised him as the liberator of the human race; and as it was absolutely necessary that those who were in limbo waited for his arrival, Abraham shuddered with joy when he saw in the spirit the birth of Christ, in the certainty that he would soon come out of this place of waiting to enter heaven. How, then, could Christians be born of Christians, since faith and

<p>whom statues are raised, put their joy in vanity. But when one becomes a Christian, nature itself is clothed with this dignity, the essence of man enters into the participation of the eternal benefit of incompatibility; it is not here a mere presumption, it is an actual reality in the eyes of God. The first are like an eloquent but poor man, who is lauded with praise and lacks bread or other things necessary for life. The dignity really worthy of praise is that which shelters from all need the one who is clothed with it, who is independent by nature and needs no help, no support; such is true wealth and true glory.</p>	<p>baptism are two necessary conditions for being a Christian?</p>
---	--

### **(Galatians 2:16)**

#### **2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT**

**QUESTION 5. IF NO ONE IS JUSTIFIED BY THE LAW BEFORE GOD, WHY IS IT WRITTEN: CURSED HE WHO WILL NOT REMAIN FAITHFUL TO ALL THE PRESCRIPTIONS OF THE LAW, TO PUT THEM INTO PRACTICE? (DEUT. 27:26) IF MEN ARE JUSTIFIED BY FAITH AND NOT BY LAW, WHY THIS CURSE ON HIM WHO HAS NOT FULFILLED THE LAW, SINCE IT IS USELESS FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS? —** The law given by Moses produced justice, it is true, but a worldly justice, a temporary justice for those who observed it, and who discharged them simply of guilt, for the just according to the law is the one that does not do wrong to no one. Which makes the Apostle say: "The law is not according to faith, but he who observes these precepts will find life there" (Gal. 3:12), that is to say, he who fulfills the law will not die, he will live by the present life. Justice, on the contrary, which comes from faith, justifies men before God and makes them worthy of the rewards of the future time.

For it is right, indeed, to know who and by whom we are, so that the true confession of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit may lead us to the kingdom of heaven. The elders themselves who, in observance of the precepts of the law, have joined the love of God with the hope of promises, have been justified before God. It is the law alone which according to the doctrine of the Apostle cannot make men just before God, just as faith alone to the exclusion of works is not sufficient to render them pleasing to God; to render men perfect, the justice of the earth must be joined to divine justice. This is what the Savior teaches us when He says, "If your righteousness is no more abundant than that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will not enter the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 5:20)

**(Galatians 3:20)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 57.** WHY WAS IT NECESSARY FOR THE APOSTLE, IN THE REPROACHES HE ADDRESSES TO THE GALATIANS, TO INSERT THE REFLECTION THAT FOLLOWS? THE GALATIANS, AFTER HAVING EMBRACED THE GOSPEL, HAVING RETURNED AGAIN TO THE OBSERVANCES OF THE LAW, THE APOSTLE SAYS TO THEM, "A MEDIATOR IS NOT JUST FOR ONE PERSON ALONE, BUT GOD IS ONE," AS IF THE GALATIANS DENIED THE EXISTENCE OF A SINGLE GOD, THEY HAD INDEED BEEN BROUGHT BACK TO THE LAW IN THE NAME OF THIS DOCTRINE WHICH MADE THEM BELIEVE IN THE EXISTENCE OF ONE AND ONLY GOD, AND LOOK UPON CHRIST AS A PREDESTINATED MINISTER OF GOD TO DISTRIBUTE TO MEN THE GIFT OF GOD'S GRACE. — It is certain that the Galatians, by letting themselves be dragged back into the observance of the law, professed to believe in Jesus Christ, but their faith was not worthy of him; it was the faith of Photin; since the law, he said, teaches the existence of one God, it is contrary to the law to say that Jesus Christ is God. It was the invention of the Jews, who, overcome by the brilliance of the miracles they witnessed, believed in Jesus Christ after his death, that is to say, while professing to believe in Jesus Christ, they still wanted to keep

the law, as if one did not place all his hope in Jesus Christ. It is these Christians whom the Apostle calls false brothers. (Gal. 2:4, 2 Cor. 11:26) Thus, after the teaching given by the apostles, they had corrupted the spirit of the Galatians and wanted to make them Jews under the name of the Savior. This is why the Apostle says that Christ came to be the mediator of circumcision and uncircumcision: "To form in himself one new man and to bring peace between the two peoples," he writes to the Ephesians. (Eph. 2:15) If therefore Jesus came as a mediator, and the office of the mediator is to bring peace between the two parties, and to draw a new rule by stripping them both of their way of seeing, Our Lord reconciles them so that they attach themselves exclusively to his feeling and thus renounce all the causes of their old discords. On one side the Jew supports circumcision, on the other the good man claims that one should not be circumcised, and opposition reigns between them. Take away this principle of discord, and peace is reborn immediately. Now, if it be so, says St. Paul, why do you, Galatians who make you Jews, want to destroy the office of mediator of Jesus Christ? This is why he says to them, "You are strangers to Jesus Christ." They despise the principle of reconciliation which he had established between the two peoples, and they return to the old ideas of the Jews, condemning themselves by the same as well as the one who reconciled them, for all that displeases is by the same accused and sentenced. And as the reason that brought back the Galatians to the observance of the law, was that they believed in one God, but without any mystery, and that they regarded as contrary to the law of recognizing the divinity of Christ. The Apostle says to them, "A mediator is not one, but two. For you, on the contrary, who return to the law, you refuse the mediator; however, God is one." The Apostle, in thus establishing the divinity of Jesus Christ, does not wish to make a God other than the one who exists, nor to teach that there are two Gods; God is one, he tells them, as it is written in the law. When we teach, in effect, that Jesus Christ is God from God, we do not claim to authorize belief in another God, for what is of God does not suffer to be called another God. Whether we consider God or what is God, it is always one God. There is no difference between God and what is of God. It is another himself; it is another because of the distinct person who is called the Son; it is the same because of the unity of substance. Let it not be wrong that I here employ the name of a person whom some believe must reject; Let us follow the

example of the Apostle who says to the Corinthians, "If I gave anything, I gave it because of you, in the person of Jesus Christ." (2 Cor. 2:10)

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT <b>(Galatians 4:3)</b>	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT <b>(Galatians 4:3)</b>
<p><b>QUESTION 82.</b> NO DOUBT THE PAGANS WERE SUBJECT TO THE ELEMENTS OF THE WORLD. WHY THEN DOES THE APOSTLE SAY, "WE OURSELVES WERE ENSLAVED UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD." IF THE JEWS WERE THEMSELVES ENSLAVED TO THE ELEMENTS, HOW WERE THE PAGANS DIFFERENT? — It is certain that adding, deleting or changing a single syllable is enough to distort the meaning of a proposition. But everyone knows that the Gentiles worshiped the elements. The Jews, on the other hand, rendered no worship to the elements, but they served God with the help of the elements, that is to say, elementary institutions, such as the new moons, the Sabbath, circumcision and other similar prescriptions which are primitive and carnal, because all that is visible is carnal and comes from the elements. But as these prescriptions were of divine institution, they were part of the worship that was rendered to God; these visible things had the effect of raising minds to invisible things, and the fidelity to these prescriptions made</p>	<p><b>QUESTION 59.</b> NO DOUBT THE PAGANS WERE ENSLAVED TO THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD. WHAT, THEN, ARE THESE WORDS OF THE APOSTLE: "WE WERE OURSELVES UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD." IF THE JEWS WERE THEMSELVES UNDER THE ELEMENTS, HOW WERE THE PAGANS DIFFERENT? — The pagans are not only subjugated under the elements, but enslaved to the elements themselves, for they adore in the firmament the stars, the sun, the moon, the luminaries; in the lower world, the earth, the water; in the sea, Neptune; in the underworld, Pluto; in a word, everything is God for them in creation, with the exception of the Creator. The Jews were also under the elements; but yet they served God who was the author of these institutions. They observed new moons, sabbaths, sacrifices of animals. At the beginning of the seventh month they sounded the trumpet, and on the fifteenth day of that month they took the fruits of the most beautiful tree, the branches of the palm trees, the branches of the most tender trees, the branches of the willows, and they lived seven days</p>

them capable of understanding greater truths and worthy of spiritual promises. In this respect, therefore, which I have indicated, the Jews were subjugated under the elements; but on the other hand they had a spiritual law that defended sin and exhorted the love of the Lord God, who according to the promise made to them, was to come for the remission of sins.

under tents formed of these branches of the tree. (Lev. 23:40) In observing these prescriptions, the Jews were under the elements in a true sense, because they have for their object the elements. Christians, on the contrary, by serving God, not under the elements, but rising above the elements, and hastening to arrive at the heavenly Jerusalem worship God in spirit, not with the help of external things and visible, but by an inner worship, and rendering homage invisible to the invisible God, following the Lord's recommendation in his Gospel: "The hour is coming when true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth." (Jn. 4:23) So the truth is to serve God in spirit, and worship him where the spirit has more share than the body, because God is spirit. In one respect the Jews were thus subjugated under the elements, as I have recalled; but, on the other hand, the end of their law was wholly spiritual; it forbade them to sin, commanded them to love God with all their heart and to put their hope in Jesus Christ. Now, while the apostles preached to them all these spiritual duties, the Jews defended the elementary and carnal institutions. St. Paul recalls this memory to confound the Jews who remained enslaved to visible observances, and despised the spiritual part of the law. The Apostle therefore wants to show them the weakness and powerlessness of these practices compared to the law of faith,

and he does so by intervening personally in the debate, he who was once a zealous zealot of these observances. But as soon as he had known Jesus Christ, he would have nothing but contempt for these practices, for the grace of God given to us by Jesus Christ differs immensely from the law of works.

### (Galatians 4:12)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 60.** THE APOSTLE TELLS THE GALATIANS THAT HE REPROVES AND CONDEMNS IN ALL THIS EPISTLE: "BE LIKE ME, SINCE I AM LIKE YOU." IF HE SHOWED HIMSELF AS THEY WERE, IT WAS USELESS TO SAY TO THEM: BE LIKE ME. PERHAPS HE HAD IMITATED THEM IN SOMETHING, AND THAT HE WANTED THEM TO BE SIMILAR IN OTHER RESPECTS? — What could the Apostle imitate in them, or what could he fail the doctor of the nations? He therefore exhorts the Galatians to be his imitators, and he refutes the impossibility that they could object by saying to them: I am what you are, for you are men as I am; do what I do. These words may be related to what he said was done to everyone by sharing their ideas when they were true to the truth, especially those of the Gentiles. (1 Cor. 9:22) There were among the Jews institutions that should no longer be observed, but whose observance was once legitimate, such as circumcision, Sabbath observance, new moons, the distinction of food. But he shows that the truths which he thought he ought to approve among the Gentiles never cease to be obligatory. So they think that the world is the work of God and of men, it is the one thing that always remains. If, therefore, he associates himself here with their feelings, he urges them to become equally like him, that is, to believe what he believes himself.

**(Galatians 5:17)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT**

**QUESTION 61.** HOW DO WE HAVE THE USE OF OUR FREE WILL AND OF OUR CHOICE, SINCE THE APOSTLE SAYS: "THE FLESH HAS DESIRES CONTRARY TO THOSE OF THE SPIRIT, AND THE SPIRIT IS CONTRARY TO THOSE OF THE FLESH, AND THEY ARE OPPOSED TO ONE ANOTHER, SO THAT YOU DO NOT DO ALL THE THINGS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE?" IF THE FLESH HAS DESIRES CONTRARY TO THOSE OF THE SPIRIT, THEN IT IS BAD, BECAUSE THE SPIRIT ONLY SUGGEST GOOD THINGS. — Here it is meant by the flesh not the very substance of the flesh, but the evil deeds and wickedness that are signified by the flesh. As every error has its source in external and visible things, and the flesh is in contact with them, since it is a compound of the elements of this world, the Apostle gives the name of flesh to all error. It is not only adultery, fornication, impurity that he places among the works of the flesh, but idolatry, malice, blasphemy, and other similar crimes. Does the flesh call for blasphemy or idolatry? Is it not the vices of the soul that consents to error? Yet he is right in saying to those who do good: You are no longer in the flesh, but in the spirit. And yet they are still in the body. He, therefore, who walks in the path of virtue and who does not reject the hope of the faithful, though he lives still in the flesh, is no longer in the flesh. He, on the contrary, who does evil and opens his lips to blasphemy; the Apostle says that he is in the flesh and that he is flesh; for just as good men are spiritual, yet united with the flesh, those who engage in evil are carnal despite their union with the soul. Here is the explanation of the words of the Apostle. This error, which he calls the flesh, covets against the spirit, that is to say it suggests guilty desires against that same spirit which is the law of God. Indeed, he wants to clearly point to two laws here: the law of God and the law of the devil. He uses the name of spirit, because the law of God is spiritual to fight against the flesh, that is to say against the vices to keep man to God. On the contrary, the law of the devil, which is the error, is in struggle against the spirit by the seductions of sensuality and the false sweets of the world. In the midst of these two opposite laws is man; does he wish to consent to the inspirations of the spirit, the flesh does not want it; he lends a helping hand to the flesh, he despises the spirit, that is to say the law of God. Is

he about to surrender to the solicitations of the flesh, the spirit holds him back so that he does not do what he wants; does he wish to follow the inspirations of the spirit, the flesh urges him not to do what he thinks is useful; but the spirit opposes to the flesh a just and wise resistance, and seeks to snatch the man from the counsels of Satan. But the flesh, that is to say, the opposite law, uses its solicitations, resists the spirit of the law only to deceive by its ploys. The Apostle, in establishing the reign of these two laws, has for design to show to free will which side he should incline his will. He does not want to destroy free will, but to teach him the choice he has to make. If man had not the free use of his will, neither the law of the devil, which is the flesh, nor the law of God, which is the spirit, would be in conflict with one another, in soliciting the man to follow their inspirations, because to solicit is to persuade. But he who persuades does not do violence, he tries to dodge himself, and he who gives in to his suggestions sees his will changing under the influence of these deceptive counsels. Now, if free will did not exist, the man would be driven in spite of himself to do what he does not want.

### (Galatians 6:1)

#### 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT

**QUESTION 10. WHY DOES SAINT PAUL SAY TO THE GALATIANS: I AM ASTONISHED THAT YOU WOULD SOON LEAVE THE ONE WHO CALLED YOU TO THE GRACE OF JESUS CHRIST TO PASS TO ANOTHER GOSPEL, ALTHOUGH THERE IS NO OTHER GOSPEL? IF IT IS ANOTHER, IT IS NOT THE SAME; IF HE IS NOT THE SAME, HOW IS HE NOT ANOTHER?**— The Apostle calls another Gospel the one that was preached to the Galatians, because it was different from the one they later began to follow. They had let themselves be diverted from the Gospel of Jesus Christ and into Judaism under the very name of Jesus Christ as if it were absolutely necessary to embrace it, and they taught principles quite different from the doctrine of the Apostle. That is why he adds: "As they seek to persuade you." Indeed, the false apostles, to more easily deceive the Gentiles who embraced the faith, presented to them as the doctrine of the Savior their own inventions, as we see in the Acts of the Apostles: "If you are circumcised according to the law of Moses, you cannot be saved." (Acts

15:1) Also a great pain takes hold of the soul of the Apostle at the sight of the perversion of the Galatians and he says to them, "I am astonished that you should leave the person who called you to the grace of Jesus Christ to move on to another gospel, even though there was none else." He is astonished, therefore, that, having borne a light burden, and much less heavy, they were willing to undertake hard and painful obligations, that is to say, instead of the simple doctrine of the faith, they endeavored to be circumcised, to observe the new moons, the Sabbath, by once again subjecting himself to the elements, and so as not to appear to furnish to the false apostles the pretext of saying that the doctrine which the Apostles received was not in accordance with the tradition of truth, he immediately adds: "Not that he disturbs him among you, and who wishes to change the gospel of Jesus Christ." The Gospel to which the Apostle had called them was therefore different from that which they had begun to follow under the influence of the false apostles. However, there was no other gospel than that which Jesus Christ had taught, and that alone was enough to convince them that they had been misled and bring them back to the only doctrine of faith, confessing that Jesus Christ God is the only principle of salvation, and it is through him and not by law that they have received the remission of their sins that the grace of God forgives under the law.

## COLOSSIANS

(Colossians 2:3)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 62.** IF "ALL THE TREASURES OF KNOWLEDGE AND WISDOM ARE HIDDEN IN JESUS CHRIST," HOW CAN THE SAME SAVIOR SAY THAT HE KNOWS NEITHER THE DAY NOR THE HOUR OF THE FUTURE JUDGMENT? (MARK 13:32) IF HE KNOWS IT AND SAYS HE DOES NOT KNOW IT, IS IT NOT A LIE? — These words contain a twofold meaning. The Apostle first wants to say that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in Jesus Christ, in the sense that he who has Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ, takes his place from all wisdom and all knowledge. That is to say, that to know Jesus Christ is to know everything, and to understand all wisdom, as St. Paul says to the Colossians: "Beware lest any man deceive you by philosophy and by vain subtleties according to the principles of a worldly knowledge and not according to Jesus Christ, for all the fullness of divinity dwells in him bodily. (Col. 2:8) That is to say, he who believes in Jesus Christ far from wanting nothing for salvation, has all in abundance, because his faith is for the fullness of the deity. He adds again in the same Epistle: "Let no one deceive you by pretending to be humble, by a superstitious worship of angels, by taking pride in what he sees, vainly inflated by his carnal prudence, and not a chief whose whole body, supported by his bonds and his joints, maintains and grows with the growth of God. (Ibid. 18, 19) If, therefore, believing in Jesus Christ, Christians worship him as the head of all principality and power, they need no other thing, they have all that is necessary to be saved, and ignorance of things useless to salvation will be of no danger to them, because they know what is necessary. We can therefore say of those Christians who know what is useful to the saint, that they know all things. These words still signify that all the treasures of knowledge and wisdom are hidden in the Savior. All the secrets of the Father are known to him, he measures the extent of all creatures; the Father judges no one, but he has given all judgment to the Son (Jn. 5:22); and no one knows what is in God except the Spirit of God who is also the Spirit of Jesus Christ. (1 Cor. 2:11) How then can one say that he knows neither

the day nor the hour, he whose spirit knows what is in God, and of whom he has said that he has received what is his? (Jn. 16:14-15) Now if the one who has received from his own knows the future things, how can this knowledge be denied to Christ who sent the Holy Spirit? Can we assume that the Judge who predicted us all the warning signs of this judgment, ignores the day? It may also be said that he does not know those to whom he has said: "Truly I say to you, I do not know you." (Matt. 25:12) He will probably not know the foolish and careless virgins, because at this request: "Lord, Lord, open to us," he answers them, "I tell you, verily, I do not know you." So there is a reason He tells us that he does not know what he knows, and in another place he makes this recommendation: "Watch, because you do not know what time your master is coming." (Ibid. 24:42) It is therefore to excite our attentiveness and our vigilance that to the question that is made to him, he answers that he knows neither the day nor the time of the judgment to come, but it is in our interest that he says he does not know what he knows. We do not know what is useful to us, and we want to know things whose knowledge can only be harmful to us. Now, Jesus Christ, who desires our salvation above all else, declares that he does not know that day so as not to let us know what it would be dangerous for us to know. If there is a patient who, in the excess of pain, asks for a sword to take his life away, will he accuse you of lying if you will answer that you have none, knowing that by complying to his request it can only be harmful to him?

## PHILIPPIANS

(**Philippians 2:17**)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 63.** HOW IS IT THAT THE APOSTLES, AFTER HAVING HEALED ALL THE SICK WHO WERE PRESENTED TO THEM, HAVE NOT CURED THE DISEASES OF THEIR OWN DISCIPLES? FOR, AFTER ALL, EPAPHRODITUS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SICK UNTO DEATH IF THE PRAYERS OF THE APOSTLE HAD BEEN ANSWERED. WHO CAN DOUBT, INDEED, THAT THE APOSTLE HAS OFTEN ASKED GOD FOR HIS CURE WITHOUT BEING ABLE TO OBTAIN IT? FOR IF GOD HAD ANSWERED IT, THIS AILMENT WOULD HAVE DISAPPEARED AT ONCE. — The Apostles did wonders and miracles to bring the faithful to the faith. At the sight of these brilliant facts, which it was impossible for men to do, they recognized the voice of God in the preaching of the Apostles, and these miracles were for them a demonstration of the high wisdom of the faith. Words are always subject to contradiction, acts of power come to serve them as witnesses, and failing them, to prove the high reason of faith that words are powerless to express. For the faithful, on the contrary, miracles and wonders are not necessary, but a firm hope. As soon as he is convinced of the truth of the promises, the spirit is made a weapon of this conviction to arrive by contempt of the enjoyments present to make himself worthy of eternal goods, and to increase his merits by his work, following this recommendation of Solomon: "My son, while approaching the service of God, abide in righteousness and fear, and prepare your soul for temptation. (Eccl. 2:1) This recommendation is based on the usefulness of trials for man. This is what makes the Apostle also say: "It is through many tribulations that we must enter the kingdom of God." (Acts 14:21) These temptations that arise from trials come to us in different ways, so that the soul that in the midst of these tribulations perseveres in the faith that it has received, may obtain the crown. Now it is not only on faith that man is tempted, but by illness, by loss, by persecutions, by the death of those

dear to him; and if in the midst of these various trials he does not let himself be carried away to implore the help of demons, he obtains in the outpouring of his blood the glory of martyrdom. If, therefore, the Apostle did not obtain what he asked, it was not an evil but a good thing for Epaphroditus; It was thus that the Apostle, having prayed to God to deliver him from a personal ailment, received this answer: "My grace is sufficient for you, for virtue is perfected in infirmity." (2 Cor. 12:9)

**(Philippians 2:27)**

**2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT**

**QUESTION 11.** THE APOSTLE ST. PAUL URGES US NOT TO GRIEVE ABOUT THE DEAD, WHICH IS PROPER TO THOSE WHO HAVE NO HOPE; AND HE HIMSELF SAYS TO US ELSEWHERE, WHEN HE SPEAKS OF EPAPHRODITUS: "HE HAS BEEN SICK UNTO DEATH, BUT GOD HAS PITY ON HIM; AND NOT ONLY OF HIM, BUT ALSO OF ME, SO THAT I DID NOT HAVE AFFLICTION ON AFFLICTION." WHY DOES HE FORBID CHRISTIANS TO BE SAD, SINCE HE DECLARES THAT THE DEATH OF EPAPHRODITUS HIMSELF WOULD HAVE THROWN HIM INTO GREAT SADNESS? — The pain that the Apostle forbids Christians is not that which he would have felt from the death of Epaphroditus had he come. The reason why this death would have caused him sadness was that he lost in him an auxiliary, a support in the preaching of the Gospel. As for us, St. Paul forbids us to grieve, as if we were crying for lost dead without return and without hope of resurrection. There is, then, a great difference between the tears caused by the absence of an auxiliary, of a friend, and the pain produced by the death of a person who is no longer thought to exist. On one side there is no more consolation possible, on the other despair alone is excluded.

## 1 PETER

(**1 Peter 2:21**)

2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 64.** THE APOSTLE ST. PETER SAYS, "CHRIST DIED FOR YOU." ST. PAUL, ON THE CONTRARY, CLAIMS THAT HE DIED FOR HIM. "HE IS," SAID HE, "RENDERED OBEDIENT TILL DEATH; WHEREFORE GOD HAS GIVEN HIM A NAME WHICH IS ABOVE EVERY NAME." (PHILIP. 2:8-9) NOW IF THIS IS SO, SHOULD WE NOT CONCLUDE THAT IT WAS IMPERFECT, SINCE HE OWES TO HIS WORKS AN INCREASE OF GLORY? — No one doubts among the faithful that the Son of God has received all the perfection of his divine birth. He received from the birth of God the Father all the attributes of the Father's divinity. It was then that he received a name that is above every name, that is to say the very name of God that is common to him with the Father. Because in him no perfection is yet to come, he has them all eternally. He is born to create and repair all things. Order and reason require that every knee bend in the name of the Father. The Father communicates this prerogative to the Son, in view of the works he was to perform, but he communicates it to him through the generation. By engendering him, he gives him the same honor, the same glory that he has himself.

## REVELATION

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
<p><b>(Revelation 10:8)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 72.</b> WHEN WE READ IN REVELATION, "GO AND TAKE THE OPEN BOOK OUT OF THE HAND OF THE ANGEL AND DEVOUR IT, AND IT WILL BE BITTER IN YOUR BOWELS, BUT IN YOUR MOUTH IT WILL BE SWEET AS HONEY." WHAT IS THIS BOOK THAT IS SWEET AND BITTER IN THE BOWELS? — All divine Scriptures are bitter for unbelievers and carnal men. Thus, it is unpleasant for idolaters to hear one God preaching in Jesus Christ. This doctrine captures Photin with horror and fear. Sabellius also blushes to hear a Father who cannot be called the Son, because he is the principle of all things, and a Son who is called Son, because he is not the Father, but he is of the Father, and it is not of him, but by him are all things. Arius is also condemned by reading that Jesus Christ is the true Son of God, because he could be called his true Son, if he did not come from God in a rigorous sense. This doctrine convinces Marcion of a lie by teaching him, who denies that Christ has true flesh, that the Word has become flesh. (Jn. 1:14) She also accuses the shameless Manichean, showing him in the story</p>	<p><b>(Revelation 10:8)</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 65.</b> WHAT DO THESE WORDS SAY TO ST. JOHN IN REVELATION: GO, "TAKE THE BOOK AND DEVOUR IT, AND IT WILL BE BITTER IN YOUR BOWELS, BUT IN YOUR MOUTH IT WILL BE SWEET AS HONEY." WHAT IS THIS BOOK, OR IS IT SWEET, HOW CAN IT BE BITTER IN THE BOWELS? — All divine Scriptures are bitter for unbelievers and carnal men. Thus, it is unpleasant for idolaters to hear one God preaching in Jesus Christ. This doctrine captures Photin with horror and fear. Sabellius also blushes to hear a Father who cannot be called the Son, because he is the principle of all things, and a Son who is called Son, because he is not the Father, but he is of the Father, and it is not of him, but by him are all things. Arius is also condemned by reading that Jesus Christ is the true Son of God, because he could be called his true Son, if he did not come from God in a rigorous sense. This doctrine convinces Marcion of a lie by teaching him, who denies that Christ has true flesh, that the Word has become flesh. (Jn. 1:14) She also accuses the shameless Manichean, showing him in the story of the Evangelist, forbidding</p>

of the Evangelist, forbidding marriage and preaching a shameful promiscuity, that the Savior not only honored the marriage of his presence, but provided the spouses with the wine they needed. (Jn. 2:1-11) These are the truths contained in the book that the Apostle received to devour. This book is the gospel according to St. John, that is, bitter not only for those who interpret it sinfully, but for wild and unrestrained minds who do not want to change their lives and sink deeper into evil. Now, this revelation took place at the time that the Apostle St. John was on the island of Patmos where the Emperor Domitian had exiled him for the cause of faith. He was then delighted in the spirit to be able to contemplate the mysteries of heaven, and while God revealed to him the shocks he reserved for ungodliness, adultery, and other crimes, he was given a book which was sweet to the mouth, but bitter in the bowels; that is to say, among the Christians who appear to be one body, he must be gentle to those who are shown by the mouth, because of their holy and irreproachable life, for a thing is not sweet in the mouth only when it is one and without mixing; but it must be bitter to those whom the depravity of heresy renders carnal in their actions as well as in their feelings, and which are shown by the insides, for this book will be their accuser in the day of the judgment of God. As a result of this revelation, God gives him the order to

marriage and preaching a shameful promiscuity, that the Savior not only honored the marriage of his presence, but provided the spouses with the wine they needed. (Jn. 2:1-11) These are the truths contained in the book that the Apostle received to devour. This book is the gospel according to St. John, that is, bitter not only for those who interpret it sinfully, but for wild and unrestrained minds who do not want to change their lives and sink deeper into evil. Now, this revelation took place at the time that the Apostle St. John was on the island of Patmos where the Emperor Domitian had exiled him for the cause of faith. He was then delighted in the spirit to be able to contemplate the mysteries of heaven, and while God revealed to him the shocks he reserved for ungodliness, adultery, and other crimes, he was given a book which was sweet to the mouth, but bitter in the bowels; that is to say, among the Christians who appear to be one body, he must be gentle to those who are shown by the mouth, because of their holy and irreproachable life, for a thing is not sweet in the mouth only when it is one and without mixing; but it must be bitter to those whom the depravity of heresy renders carnal in their actions as well as in their feelings, and which are shown by the insides, for this book will be their accuser in the day of the judgment of God. As a result of this revelation, God gives him the order to write his Gospel for the reasons we

write his Gospel for the reasons we have said. The prophet Ezekiel was also ordered to take a book that was sweet to his mouth, when he sent it to reproach the people for their infidelity. (Ezek. 3:1) It often happens that in seeking to abbreviate, one falls into error. Why do not you expose all the elements of a question, and remove some of it to make the meaning more obscure? So John was told, "Go, and take this book that is in the hand of the angel, and devour it, and it will be sweet in your mouth like honey, but it will be bitter in your bowels"; And God adds, "You must still prophesy to a great many peoples and nations." (Rev. 8:9-11) Now, the truth is that St. John wrote his Gospel after his exile. He had been exiled on the island of Patmos by the Emperor Domitian, and it was there that he had a revelation on a Sunday day, as he himself says; and as a result of this revelation, he wrote his gospel, which is bitter to the heretics fathomed by the bowels, for they are carnal because they make false ideas of Christ. But in your mouth, it is said to John, it will be sweet as honey. God makes all Christians one body, in which they are the members of one another; the mouth which is part of the head, is the figure of the most honorable and most faithful for the truth that comes from Jesus Christ is full of sweetness. The bowels are heretics because they are carnal. Also, the truth discovers that Jesus Christ is true God is bitter to

have said. The prophet Ezekiel was also ordered to take a book that was sweet to his mouth, when he sent it to reproach the people for their infidelity. (Ezek. 3:1) It often happens that in seeking to abbreviate, one falls into error. Why do not you expose all the elements of a question, and remove some of it to make the meaning more obscure? So John was told, "Go, and take this book that is in the hand of the angel, and devour it, and it will be sweet in your mouth like honey, but it will be bitter in your bowels"; And God adds, "You must still prophesy to a great many peoples and nations." (Rev. 8:9-11) Now, the truth is that St. John wrote his Gospel after his exile. He had been exiled on the island of Patmos by the Emperor Domitian, and it was there that he had a revelation on a Sunday day, as he himself says; and as a result of this revelation, he wrote his gospel, which is bitter to the heretics fathomed by the bowels, for they are carnal because they make false ideas of Christ. But in your mouth, it is said to John, it will be sweet as honey. God makes all Christians one body, in which they are the members of one another; the mouth which is part of the head, is the figure of the most honorable and most faithful for the truth that comes from Jesus Christ is full of sweetness. The bowels are heretics because they are carnal. Also, the truth discovers that Jesus Christ is true God is bitter to them. Indeed, the Gospel of St. John is

<p>them. Indeed, the Gospel of St. John is entirely directed against the heretics. Against Photin, who denies that Christ existed before Mary, John proves that the Savior came down from heaven. Against Arius, John shows that Christ had no beginning, because in the beginning Christ was the Son of God, God Himself in God his Father, and as nothing was done without him, it cannot be said that it was done itself, for if it had been done, something would have been done without it, but since nothing was done without it, it has always existed, who confuses the Father with the Son, and makes only one person under two different names, he confounds by the words of the Savior: "If you loved me, you would rejoice that I go to my Father, because my Father is greater than me." (Jn. 14:28) He clearly distinguishes two persons here, since the Son declares that the Father is greater than himself, and if he is alone, he cannot be more. This gospel still condemns Marcion, who denied that Christ was clothed in a true flesh, with these words: "The Word became flesh, and he has dwelt among us." (Jn. 1:14) He also fights Manichea, who does not know that Jesus Christ came into the world. and forbids marriage, in the ignorance of where the Savior has deigned to supply what was lacking at a wedding dinner. An angel also commanded the prophet Ezekiel to take a book and devour it; it must be sweet to his mouth and fill his bowels. (Ezek. 3:1) The Prophet</p>	<p>entirely directed against the heretics. Against Photin, who denies that Christ existed before Mary, John proves that the Savior came down from heaven. Against Arius, John shows that Christ had no beginning, because in the beginning Christ was the Son of God, God Himself in God his Father, and as nothing was done without him, it cannot be said that it was done itself, for if it had been done, something would have been done without it, but since nothing was done without it, it has always existed, who confuses the Father with the Son, and makes only one person under two different names, he confounds by the words of the Savior: "If you loved me, you would rejoice that I go to my Father, because my Father is greater than me." (Jn. 14:28) He clearly distinguishes two persons here, since the Son declares that the Father is greater than himself, and if he is alone, he cannot be more. This gospel still condemns Marcion, who denied that Christ was clothed in a true flesh, with these words: "The Word became flesh, and he has dwelt among us." (Jn. 1:14) He also fights Manichea, who does not know that Jesus Christ came into the world. and forbids marriage, in the ignorance of where the Savior has deigned to supply what was lacking at a wedding dinner. An angel also commanded the prophet Ezekiel to take a book and devour it; it must be sweet to his mouth and fill his bowels. (Ezek. 3:1) The Prophet received this command when God sent</p>
--	--

received this command when God sent him to take back the infidelity and disorders of his people from the bowels because of his carnal life. Of this number are those to which the prophet Isaiah gives the name of brothers, in spite of their wickedness: "You who fear God, say to those who hate you and who have not listened to my precepts, You are our brothers." (Isa. 56:5)

him to take back the infidelity and disorders of his people from the bowels because of his carnal life. Of this number are those to which the prophet Isaiah gives the name of brothers, in spite of their wickedness: "You who fear God, say to those who hate you and who have not listened to my precepts, You are our brothers." (Isa. 56:5)

## POLEMIC

### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 102. AGAINST NOVATIAN.** — The disciples say to Jesus, "Lord, do you want us to command the fire of heaven to come down and consume them? And Jesus answered them, You know not what spirit you belong to; for the son of man has not come to lose souls, but to save them." (Luke 9:54-55) The Samaritans, who did not want to receive him, certainly deserved to be punished, but Our Lord, who had come to exercise his mercy, dismissed the sentence that was suggested to him for to give them the opportunity to repent and correct themselves. When the prophet Elisha, angry with children who outraged him, cursed them, the righteousness of God avenged him, and they were devoured by bears in a place where we do not see that there was any forest. (2 Kings 2:23) But the Savior forgives the woman of bad life who is presented to her and whom the elders of the Jews claim to have surprised in adultery (Jn. 8:10), because the law of mercy which he began preaching taught to forgive and not to condemn. The law given by Moses, whose sanction was vindictive justice, was severe in the beginning. It punished with death the one who had gathered wood on the Sabbath (Num. 15:32), it commanded to stone the son of the Egyptian who had blasphemed against God (Lev. 24:21) and put to death many of the children of Israel who had worshiped the golden calf. (Exod. 32:27) Each of these two laws first of all made known to the character that was proper to it. Thus the ancient law, more inclined to punish the culprit, appeared more severe in the beginnings than the fear it inspired made the men more attentive and more vigilant. The new law, on the other hand, whose character is kindness and mercy, has shown itself in the beginning, full of gentleness and clemency, to dispose the minds of indulgence by the charm and attraction of its love. Subsequently, the law, whose greater severity had been motivated by the fragility of the human race, not only softened this rigor, but was a proof of gentleness and goodness, and the law of mercy was severe in punishment. Thus the righteousness of God struck Ananias and Sapphira with death. (Acts 5:5,10) Elimas, that unbelieving magician who resisted the law of God, became blind through an effect of God's judgment and power. (Acts 13:8)

King Herod, for not having given glory to God, was struck by the angel of God and died devoured by worms. (Acts 12:23) The preaching of mercy could have made men believe that impunity was guaranteed to their crimes; God, therefore, tempered this assurance with fear, showing that the forgiveness of the sins that he bestowed upon men had for the purpose of passing them from death to life, to preserve them with care from relapses into sin and from misfortune. to come out of this life and to appear before their judge conscience charged with crimes; for everyone is judged according to the state in which he died. The new law which has in it the plenitude of mercy so as not to become an object of contempt for the fishermen has exerted on them a severe revenge. The ancient law, on the contrary, although it was given with punishment for punishment, has sometimes pardoned not to appear too cruel; but it has cheated the greatest number of sinners, because its nature was more inclined to severity. The grace of the new law is therefore much more abundant than was the grace of the old law. Now, if this grace is more abundant, how can it be denied that it can give what was given by the ancient law, in which grace was much less, for it was much more inclined to severity? If, then, it is shown that the ancient law has forgiven repentant sinners, how can one suppose that the law of mercy is inflexible for them? The Jews were called the children of God, and the Apostle Paul tells us that they were baptized under Moses' guidance in the cloud and in the sea. (1 Cor. 10:2) Before they were here, they were purified so that they could then give an account of the law they had received and if they came to sin, they could return to God through penance, following the invitation he do them: "penance, you who go astray, and convert." (Isa. 45:22) But, may it be said, God invites to penance but does not promise forgiveness. If God invites sinners to penance, their repentance cannot be barren, and God would not have made this call to fishermen unnecessarily. It was therefore because he knew that repentant sinners would obtain forgiveness for their sins that he gave them this command, for he said in express words, "I do not want the sinner's death, but rather that he converts and lives." (Ezek. 18:32) The fruits of penance are thus assured, we have the proof, to those who are converted to God. We must therefore reject the impious assertion of Novation, which distorts the meaning of the words of the Lord by saying: The Lord expresses himself thus: "Whoever has denied me, I will deny him myself," (Matt. 10:33) that is to say, if a Christian comes to deny the Lord for any motive, any return is impossible to him, and that, if he returns, he has

no hope of being welcomed. And what becomes of the obligation to do penance? Let us not forget that after this sentence the Savior did not, however, deny his Apostle Peter, who had denied him. Why? Because, under the inspiration of repentance, he cried his fault with bitter tears (Matt. 26:75), because he knew that God forgave repentant sinners and that penance changed the dispositions of their hearts. Novatian himself assumes that one must do penance. Pressed that he is by the law, he does not dare to deny openly that one must refuse penance: he therefore tries by his subtleties to deprive it of its fruits. Since he dares to say that he who has denied God has no longer any hope of forgiveness, but that he will be denied even in the presence of the angels of God, is there not hypocrisy on his part to recommend to do penance? But his bad faith appears throughout his day when he adds: "He that has sinned against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be given him in this world or in the other." (Matt. 12:32) Although the sin against the Holy Spirit is quite different from that by which the Lord Jesus is denied, yet Novatian, to close the door of forgiveness to this last sin, confuses sin against the Holy Spirit with the one who denies the Lord, to cut off from this confusion the fruit of penance with the hope of forgiveness. If to deny the Lord is to sin against the Holy Spirit, those who are guilty of this denial cannot hope for any forgiveness, any fruit of their penance, since the Lord declares that this sin cannot be put back in this world, neither in the other. Novation therefore commits an act of duplicity by exhorting to do penance, for why this penance if it denies that sin can be erased? It is the groans, the tears, the complaints of repentance that get the sinner forgiveness and the change of life. It is because David repented and confessed his sin that he deserved his pardon and returned to all his old rights, for he remained on the throne and was endowed with prophetic spirit. (2 Sam. 12:13) Scripture gives us certain proofs; we see in the 50th Psalm his repentance and after the persecution directed against him by his son his prophetic oracles, because historically the third Psalm comes after the 50th. Shall we say that it was necessary to grant pardon to a king, but that we must not forgive people of a more humble condition? And it is not rather to those who have the power of sharing that it is necessary to forgive more with difficulty, for God does not respect people. (Rom. 2:11) The more dignified one becomes, the more serious the fault becomes, however slight it may appear in itself. Just as humility in the influential ones of the earth, participates in the elevation and brilliance of their position, so their faults are much more

reprehensible. Not to mention the sin that is forbidden to all men; there are things which are permitted to persons of a more obscure condition, and who are not so to those who are elevated in dignity. Thus they cannot without inconvenience neither trade nor enter a low-class eating house. A senator cannot also be interested without losing his dignity. Now, if those who commit these slight improprieties are worthy of blame, how much more are they reprehensible if they are guilty of real faults? We must conclude from this that the crime of David was extremely serious and from a double point of view; however, his repentance won him the pardon of his homicide and adultery, and more importantly, his tears deserved a new life. When the prophet Nathan came to him, David dared not hide his crime, he confessed publicly, saying, "I have sinned against the Lord." And the Prophet replied, "The Lord has forgiven you your sin, and you do not die, because you have repented." (2 Sam. 12:13) And as we then see him prophesied, there is no doubt that he has completely changed his life. See again Achab; the Prophet reproached him for the death of Naboth; This prince shed tears, he tears his clothes, he puts on a hair shirt, and the Lord speaks to Elijah and says to him: "Have you not seen Ahab humbled before me? I will not bring upon him in his days the evils of which I have threatened him." (1 Kgs. 21:27) The Ninevites mourn their crimes, and God saves them from death hanging over their heads and gives them life. (Jonah 3:5) These are the abundant fruits of penance, but this objection is made: Yes, God forgave, but not to the sin of idolatry, for however great these crimes may be, they are not so great as the crime of idolatry. The assertion of Novatian, who admits penitence for two enormous crimes, is thus largely destroyed, for if fornication is unworthy of pardon, as Novatian asserts, how much more homicide and adultery; but what brings out all the futility of his opinion is that he grants pardon to crimes which, by the admission of all, have a much greater gravity. Let us now examine whether God has promised to forgive idolaters. All that is not legitimately forgiven in this life will not be forgiven in the other. It is here below, as Our Lord declares, that sins are bound or loosed (Matt. 16:19); in the other life there will be only reward or condemnation. Every man justly condemned here below cannot hope to be admitted to the number of the elect in the other life. Let us hear what the Lord says about the idolaters to the prophet Jeremiah: "Go and make these words heard. Return to me, O people of Israel, says the Lord, and I will not hold my face against you, because I am merciful, says the Lord, and I will not be angry with you forever.

But acknowledge your iniquity, you have committed ungodliness, you have directed your paths to foreign gods under all trees laden with foliage." (Jer. 3:12-13) These are the promises that God makes to those who become converted after their fall; if they return to him after their apostasy, he forgives them of their sins. Here is what Jeremiah says: "My most delicate children have walked in difficult ways; they were brought as a flock delivered to his enemies. Do not be afraid, my children, and cry to the Lord, for he who has led you will remember you. As your mind has made you wander far from God, on returning to him you will seek him with ten times more ardor; for he that brought upon you these evils shall fill you with everlasting joy in saving you." (Baruch 4:26) Oh, how great is the goodness of God, how it excites those who have fallen. As it urges the idol worshipers to return to him, as a tender father, he promises his children the eternal joy of salvation if they consent to change their lives. We still read in the same Prophet: "and I will bring them back to this land, I will restore them and I will not destroy them, I will plant them and tear them no more." (Jer. 24:6) This threat he had made: "He who will sacrifice to foreign gods will uprooted," could bring down into despair those who had been guilty of this ungodliness, if those who had sacrificed to idols could not be replanted, he therefore exhorts them to repent if they want to return to their first state. If the sin is not expiated, the sentence remains. God made the Ninevites announce that in three days their city would be destroyed. (Jonah 3:4) Why in three days? to give them time to repent and revoke this sentence, or that if they persevered in their impiety, their ruin was even more just. This is what God says through his Prophet: "I do not want the death of the fisherman, but rather that he will convert and live." (Ezek. 18:32) This is why penance came to the Ninevites the forgiveness of the sins that were to be the cause of their death. Why did Noah take a hundred years to build the ark? (Gen. 6:3) It was so that those who saw him and heard from his mouth the danger which threatened them, had time to recognize themselves. God does not want anyone to perish. "The Lord," said Solomon, "pities those who repent." (Eccl. 12:3) And in another place: "You have mercy on all men, because you can do anything, and you hide their sins because of repentance." (Wis. 11:24) It is in this same feeling that Our Lord, deeply saddened by the perfidy of the Jews, exclaims: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem who slay the prophets and stone those who are sent to you, how many times did I want to gather your children, as a hen gathers her little ones under her wings, and you did not want it."

(Matt. 23:37) The Lord in all the course of the law therefore never ceases to exhort sinners to convert, because he does not want his work to perish. The only purpose which he proposed, in giving the law, was to bring men back to the truth, with the difference, however, that under the New Testament the author of the law is more merciful because He wanted his mercy to be fuller and more abundant at the time when his Son Our Lord deigned to manifest himself to men in his incarnation, so that the preaching of the Son might be more fruitful in grace than that of the servants. It was just and worthy, indeed, that the Son was for men the source of graces more abundant than the servants had been. So he immediately condemns all sins to those who convert and who believe in him, without even demanding the groans of penance. What makes the Apostle say: "The gifts and the vocation of God are without penance." (Rom. 9:29) If they come to sin afterwards, they may deserve their pardon through penitence; for it is just that, having sinned after having received mercy, it is no longer given to them with so much liberality, but that they can obtain their pardon only by moans and tears. It is impossible for man not to sin. Let us listen to the apostle Saint John: "If we say that we are without sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. But if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to deliver them and to cleanse us of all unrighteousness." (1 Jn. 1:8) Thus did David, by the admission of his sin, merit his forgiveness and the grace of a new life. It is certainly to Christians that St. John speaks here, for he adds a little lower: "My little children, I write this to you, that you may not sin. However, if someone happens to sin, we have Jesus Christ as advocate with the Father." (1 Jn. 2:1) The Apostle reminds us of this truth, so that if we come to sin after our baptism, we humbly beg our advocate to pray for us to his Father. If penance existed under the old law, how would it have lost its strength under the new law which is as good as the first a law of mercy? How will God, who has pitied his enemies by calling them to the benefit of grace, show mercy to his friends to reward them (for the tribulation of the heart is the reward of repentance)? If it were otherwise, men would have reason to sadden themselves for having ceased to be the enemies of God to become his friends. What idea would we have of God, if he had mercy on his enemies without demanding penance, and refused it to his repentant friends? Moreover, the Lord knows that the devil attacks the friends and servants of God with more violence and perseverance, as the Apostle Saint Peter recalls in these terms: "Be sober and watch, because the devil your enemy moves

around like a roaring lion, looking for someone to devour." (1 Pet. 5:8) He knows we have to fight against an enemy whose cruelty equals strength; if, therefore, we come to be conquered, he wants us to seek refuge in his powerful protection; he has compassion for the sad state in which we are reduced, and puts on his strength so that we can resist with new courage. As if the days of which the Lord spoke were not abridged (Matt. 24:22), all flesh would be destroyed; thus no one can be saved if men are closed to the ways of penance. If no one, says the Holy Spirit, can boast of having a pure heart (Prov. 20:9); if no one, as he says elsewhere, is undefiled, not even the child whose life is only one day (Job 19:4), who can escape the justice of God, if the value of penance is contested? And what do these words of the Lord become: "That there will be joy in heaven for a sinner who does penance?" (Luke 15:7) But great crimes, says Novatian, are unworthy of forgiveness, for example fornication and idolatry, and what will become of this word of the Lord, where he promises that all sins, all blasphemies will be handed to men? "Blasphemy alone against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven them." (Matt. 12:31) According to this testimony of the Savior, all sins will be forgiven except one. Choose now, Novatian, and say to whom these words apply; Is it to those who do not believe yet, or to those who have embraced the faith? If it be to those who do not believe, how are they forgiven of sins, though it is certain that before believing in God, they have sinned against God and the Holy Spirit? Some of them, in fact, treat the Savior's actions with magical operations, and ascribe to demons the works of the Holy Spirit. If you apply these words to the faithful, your assertion is destroyed because "all sins will be forgiven; and whosoever shall speak against the son of man, he shall be forgiven." (Matt. 13:12) Any sin against God or against Jesus Christ will be forgiven of men; for the Savior understood them all except the sin against the Holy Spirit. He does not here confound the sin against God with the sin against the Holy Spirit, for if it were his intention, he would not have nominally excepted this sin. He therefore wanted to signify another sin by this blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (and here we must understand the person and not the nature of the Holy Spirit); therefore all sins will be delivered either by means of penance to those who believe, or by baptism to those who are ready to embrace the faith. As for the sin that the Jews committed against the Holy Spirit, it is of another kind in relation to the time in which they lived. Our Lord declares that this sin will not be forgiven them in this life or the other; for it is not by error,

but by malice, that they have sinned against the Holy Spirit. They knew from their understanding that the works of the Savior were the works of God, and to distract the people from believing in him they attributed them to the prince of demons. This is why Our Lord said to them, "for you have taken away the key of knowledge; you did not enter yourselves, and you hindered those who were entering." (Luke 11:52) This sentence has therefore been pronounced against malevolent spirits who have no longer any hope of salvation. For nothing is more enormous than this crime, for it pretends to present as false what it knows to be the truth under the law of God, and to whom Christ had been promised, saw the wonders which he performed, and recognized in him the fulfillment of the promises which God had made to them, but jealousy blinded them to the point of denying them the truth of these wonders, even more, even to persecute him and put him to death, so it is not right that this sin be ever given to them, since at the very judgment of their conscience they have dared to resist God, whose faithful servants they called themselves, but the sins against God or against Jesus Christ have different causes. So you envy the happiness of others, the pain of your darkness makes you exhale complaints against the Creator; or a sudden misfortune that melt on you excites your anger and makes you unfair to your Father. It is same as the incarnation of Jesus Christ leads to insult God. In ignorance where they are of the mystery of Christ incarnate, they are the object of their blasphemies, and regard it as unworthy that the Son of God, who is of an incorporeal and simple nature, has consented to be born as an ordinary man. They blaspheme this mystery because they do not know it. So they must be reached when they convert, because they are against the truth, while believing to defend their interests. After being tested and disarmed, they proclaim the truth of what they were doing. But for the Jews of whom we have spoken, their feelings as their actions have been very different; without another judge and without any other executioner, they are tormented and punished by the testimony of their own conscience. The one whom error makes enemies of the truth, comes to be converted, he rejoices to have known the truth; but for the evil spirit he has nothing he can correct; for if he converts, he will recognize as true what he previously knew was false. But as for the Holy Spirit, there is no reason for injustice to him; his action cannot displease anyone, since it is revealed only in the power that works miracles and wonders. Who would dare to attack him on seeing him raise the dead? Who would dare to be angry with him when he sees

that his power renders movement to the paralyzed, sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf? How rather not to love the one whom he sees driving away foul spirits, to purify the lepers, and to heal all the ills? However, the Jews preferred to outrage him by attributing his works to the demons, because they thus found the means of appeasing their hatred and their envy against the Savior. So he declares that this sin will not be forgiven them in this world or the other. But Novatian claims that larger crimes are handed over after baptism, and he cites idolatry and fornication by name. All sins, he says, are set in baptism; but if the faithful then come to commit a grave error, they have no more pardon to hope for, because after having received the Holy Spirit, one must no longer sin against the Holy Spirit. Who will deny that one should never sin, if it were possible? But God, who knew the fragility of the human race, has always prepared for men salutary remedies, where they would find a way to recover from their falls. If, on the contrary, the Holy Spirit forbids giving sinners the benefit of penance, we come to doubt of Divine Providence under the new covenant, and those who lived under the old will appear much more favored, since this remedy they were not refused. And how then will grace be more abundant under the New Testament than under the Old? God would have treated men as enemies, if, knowing that penance was for them an indispensable condition of salvation, he would have given them the Holy Spirit, but without any hope of forgiveness or reparation, if they came to offend by the effect of fear or error. He would have looked for an opportunity to lose men rather than save them. But far from us this thought, for Our Lord said: "The Son of man did not come to lose souls, but to save them." (Luke 9:56) If God makes it our duty to forgive us up to seventy times seven times the sins we commit against each other, on the sole condition that we repent (Matt. 18:22), how much more will he forgive those who have offended him and come back to him? God wants the conversion of every sinner. The Apostle teaches us that forgiveness was granted to the fornicators and filthy, when he said, "and I may have to mourn over many of those who sinned before and have not repented of the impurity, immorality, and licentiousness which they have practiced." (2 Cor. 12:21) He thus proves that some who are for him a subject not of sadness but of joy, have done penance for these crimes; some others, on the contrary, have not made penance of their fornications, which is why the Apostle weeps, because their impenitence has closed the doors of life to them. For if the penance of these crimes should last all this life, he would

not say that he weeps because they have not done, but because they do not do penance. But because he knows that penance begins and ends here, he purposely says, "They have not done penance." He wanted that by coming to find them he could have peace by entering into communion with them. Here is a proof that we can be in communion with the fornicators after they have done penance, One cannot communicate with them as long as they do penance, this communion is permitted only when they cease to be subject to the judgment of the Church. It remains to be seen whether we can establish that forgiveness should be given especially to idolaters, and we read in the Apocalypse of the apostle St. John that penance is preached to the bishops to whom he gives the name of angels, that is to say, of envoys, in the same sense that St. Paul says to the Galatians: "You have received me as an angel of God" (Gal. 4:14), receive the order to admit the sinner to penance, and do not leave without warning about those who are stumbling blocks who bring scandal in the Church, since they themselves are of the Church. Here is what is said to St. John: ""And to the angel of the church in Pergamum write: 'The words of him who has the sharp two-edged sword. I know where you dwell, where Satan's throne is; you hold fast my name and you did not deny my faith even in the days of Antipas my witness, my faithful one, who was killed among you, where Satan dwells. But I have a few things against you: you have some there who hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to put a stumbling block before the sons of Israel, that they might eat food sacrificed to idols and practice immorality. So you also have some who hold the teaching of the Nicolaitans.' (Rev. 2:12 etc.) This doctrine of the Nicolaites was similar to that of Balaam, that is to say, a compound of idolatry and fornication (Num. 24:14, 25: 2), and he commanded to do penance. Now he speaks to those who are part of the Church, as these words prove: "This is what the Spirit says to the churches," and he indicates what will be the fruit of penance: he says, "I will give to him who conquers I will give some of the hidden manna," that penance might make him victorious over his sins. What is, in fact, true repentance, in the grief of the faults committed with the firmest intention? to stop committing them in the future? "And again to the angel of the church of Thyatira write, This is the saying of the Son of God, whose eyes are like flames of fire, and their feet like the finest brass. I know your works, your charity, the care you take for the poor, your patience and your last works more abundant than the first. But I have something to reproach you for:

you allow Jezebel, this woman who calls herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce my servants, to lead them into fornication and to make them eat meats sacrificed to idols. I gave her a time to do penance, and she does not want to repent of her prostitution. Behold, I will reduce her to her bed, and those who commit adultery with her will be in great affliction if they do not do penance for their works. I will strike her children with death, and all the churches will know that I am he who searches the reins and the hearts, and I will render to each of you according to his works. But I say to you and to the others who are at Thyatira, to all who do not follow this doctrine, and who, according to their language, do not know the depths of Satan; I will not put any other weight on you. However, keep what you have until I come. He who will be victorious and keep my works until the end, I will give him power over the nations." In this single letter to the Church of Thyatira, he confounds and condemns the double error of the Novatian heresy; he promises the fruits of penance to those who repent of their idolatry, and he shows that in the same church the contact of the wicked does not defile the good, since they are part of the same communion; for it is not to those outside the church that he wrote: "He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches." It is in the same sense that St. Paul said: "We know that all that the law says is to those who are under the law that it says it." (Rom. 3:19) And in another place: "Why would I want to judge those who are out of the Church?" (1 Cor. 6:12) The Son of God through the mouth of Saint John, therefore, it is addressed to the members of the same church to exhort some to penance and to give the others the praise they deserve: "But I say to you, and to the rest of you are in Thyatira, to all who do not follow this doctrine, that is, the doctrine of idolatry: "Keep what you have unceasing until I come," (Rev. 2:24), that is, persevere until the end, for whoever perseveres until the end will be saved." (Matt. 10:22) For the same reason, he who persevered in evil will be condemned. Thus, justly, the righteousness of the righteous will not deliver him in the day when he departs from the right path. In the same way the iniquity of the sinner will not hurt him, as soon as he becomes a convert. This is why God says through his prophet, "He who sacrifices to the gods will be uprooted, but if he converts, he will live." Our Lord expresses the truth when he says, "He who denies me, I will deny him." (Matt. 10:33) But if he converts he cannot be denied by him whom he has publicly confessed. This is why the Psalmist said: "No living man will be justified in your presence." (Ps. 142:2)

For every man is judged according to the state in which he died. God Himself teaches us that in the Church the wicked are mingled with the good until the day of judgment. "The kingdom of heaven," says he, "is like a net thrown into the sea, and contains all kinds of fish, and when they sat down on the shore, they will gather the good in a vessel, and cast out the wicked, so it will be at the end of the world: the angels will come out and separate from the kingdom of God all scandals and all those who commit iniquity." (Matt. 13:47) The same truth is expressed to us in this man who is surprised among those who were at table, not having the wedding garment." (Matt. 22:12) He is the only one who is rejected from the bosom of the Church, because the crime of his indignity does not defile others, he is known to all of them because the cause of this indignity is expressed, that is, say the defect of the wedding garment. Indeed, they all saw him wearing a garment different from that of other guests. This is what makes St. Paul say: "In a great house there are not only vases of gold and silver, but also of wood and glass." (2 Tim. 2:20) Spoke thus because of Hymenaeus and Philetus, who, while part of the Church, professed grave errors in the resurrection, and even denied it, like some of the faithful of the Church of Corinth: Novation claims that by this house one must understand the world and not the Church, for fear of being forced to admit into the same Church the mixture of the good and the bad, those who are pure with those who are not. They are not, but it is easy to reverse this interpretation. For in one house all are under the same name, and although they are of different customs, they are all known by the name of their master. The world, on the contrary, contains men of opposite professions, until they recognize gods and masters quite different. You see, then, that these words must be understood, not of the world, but of the Church in which those who live under one name lead a very different life. I am convinced that Novatian was not ignorant of this truth; but as he could not motivate his separation on just complaints; to escape a certain shame, he asked a false interpretation of the law for some bad reasons by which he tries to excuse and cover up his hatred and malignity. Here is what he answers to what we have just said: I do not deny that we must admit to penitence those who are guilty of idolatry, but I dare not say that this sin will be forgiven them, because it can only be forgiven by the one against whom it has been committed. This answer is full of bad faith, these interpretations discover and update its deceits. When he comes to tell us: It is written, "He who denies me, I will deny him." (Matt. 10:33), words out of a

mouth that cannot lie, he declares vain and unsuccessful penance from which he maintains the obligation. If the sentence has been pronounced, and by a mouth that cannot deceive, why necessarily impose on man the torture of moans and tears, you who deny its value, or who confess not to know it. Any man who gives advice to another, gives it with the clear intention that he can take advantage of it. But at home, Novatian, this confession is not sincere, and it is for you to play the minds of men that you say that we must do penance. You know perfectly well that this truth cannot be denied; you then resort to subtleties to cancel the penance not of mouth, but in reality. You declare that every man who sacrificed to idols commits sin against the Holy Spirit, a sin which, according to the words of the Gospel, you claim to have to be handed over neither in this world nor in the other. Why then say that we must do penance for this sin? Is it not obviously to make illusion. as I demonstrated. You are still trying to hide your character under other artifacts; you say that it is in the same sense that the Apostle St. Peter said to Simon: "and do penance for such a great sin, that God may forgive you, if it be possible." (Acts 8:22) But Peter considered the hardened malice, full of venom and bitterness of this man, and that is why he does not give him a certain promise. For what man has ever been so far as to want to buy the gift of God for money? This answer was therefore made to malignity rather than error. This malignity is without remedy because it cannot be excused either for error or for the necessity of being pardoned by the tears of penance. Let those who are guilty of the same crime hear the words that Peter addresses to Simon. That is why he gives him a dubious answer, because, he adds, "I see that you are full of a bitter affair, and bound to iniquity." So if after such a huge crime, Peter, however, gives a dubious answer, and no doubt God forgives those who have been dragged into sin by error or necessity, if they do a proper penance. He has given his Church the right of admitting to penance and after penance to reconciliation. Novatian still blames us. Why, he says, is the body of the Lord given to those who are known to be sinners? Can those who are judges be accusers? They should be accused and they should be known, and then they can be separated from the communion of the faithful, but what judge never takes on the role of accuser? The Lord Himself defiled in his company by Judas, whom he knew to be a thief who stole the alms given to him, and he did not send him away because no one accused him; Should we not imitate this example, and not reject the Church whose crime has not been publicly disclosed? Now I speak to the

consciousness of Novation, who never ceases to accuse us, and I beseech him to tell me if he is certain of the holiness of all those who are with him. His anger against us goes so far that he even refuses us the title of Christians, although he knows that we have received this faith which he claims to have to the exclusion of others. What makes the Christian is belief and life. If, then, you see a man profess the same faith as you, and live in the same way, why refuse him to be what you are yourself? It is certain that he who says: Jesus is the Lord, says it by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:3), because he speaks the truth; but all truth comes from God. Why do not you go to the one who speaks the truth, and answer him only by your negations? This is not the reason, it is the anger that contradicts here who makes profession to believe in God. Do you not declare to yourself the enemy of God, declaring yourself against him whose faith in God is according to the truth? Is a pagan who hears a man claim that idols are gods, deny that he is a heathen? Why challenge the title of Christian to one who professes true faith, while St. Paul says to you: "We must believe in our hearts to obtain justice, and confess with our mouths to obtain salvation." (Rom. 10:10) But you, driven by a secret hostility on which your anger blinds you, oppose God by denying that he who confesses by mouth can obtain salvation against this formal declaration of the Lord: "Whoever confess me before men, I will confess him myself." (Luke 12:8) Did he say: If Novatian confesses to me? And yet, you formulate your assertions as if you had to defend only one thing, it is that to be saved it is not enough to be a Christian, it must be Novation. But if, on the contrary, the public profession of faith in Jesus Christ is sufficient to obtain salvation, wherever this profession is found, it produces this fruit of salvation. If the tradition of this faith has been corrupted among us, if the meaning has been altered, you are right to accuse us. If, on the contrary, it is wholly in us as it is in you, in denying us you deny yourself. But you accuse the ministers of faith; Suppose your accusation is well-founded, though you cannot prove it, yet have those who have received from them the teachings of faith learned the truth or the lie? The truth spoken by a vicious man is none the less the truth, for faith and works are two different things. What does the persecutor of the Christian name pursue from his hatred? It is the profession of faith and not life. He knows that nothing is more advantageous to religion than the profession we make of being Christians, and this sacrilegious persecutor believes in this profession, which he does not want to hear because it is hated by him. But you, who profess the same

religion and bear the same character, refuse to believe in the confession that we make of the truths that you confess yourself. If you are certain that we are born to a new life, all other than you were born yourself, you would be right to believe that we are not what you are. Why am I the object of sacrilegious persecution if I am not what you are? For if I professed what you attribute to me, I would not be subject to persecution. In short, I believe in what concerns me rather than you. This is my statement that the judge asks, not yours when it comes to me. Why then challenge this statement when in this matter, by the confession of all, it is not a foreign testimony, but my personal statement that is asked either for me or against me? I did not want to turn against you for a simple name, to see if you would be falsely against me when my profession of faith would be true to the truth, or as if we did not know who to relate to. You act in bad faith here to correct your schism; for you are not ignorant that here it is my testimony that one is asking, and not a foreign attestation, and that one will regard as true what I have confessed, and not what another has denied. It is also certain that we must recognize the liberty of those who, led by the love of Jesus Christ, without examining the actions of men, hasten to embrace the faith, contenting themselves with approving in themselves what they know how to be useful to them, that is to say the true teaching of faith in Jesus Christ. Whoever believes that man needs anything else apart from the mystery of faith, insults him, it is an insult to tradition and does not have the feelings it should have on the grace of God. By demanding the personal merit of man for the gift of God to be useful to the one who receives it, he makes man a being superior or equal to the tradition of faith, whereas, however, man is far from deserving such a title. Here is what St. Paul says about this same matter: "I planted, Apollo watered, but God gave increase. Now, he who plants is nothing, neither is he who waters, but it is God who gives increase." (1 Cor. 3:6) What can we expect from man here, since he himself has received the teachings he transmits? Let us examine then what advantages will result from his holy life, or what infuriating effects of his guilty conduct. He who introduces himself desires to hear the words of God, and by believing in them he firmly believes that he will be saved. What does the good or bad life of one who transmits the teachings of faith do here? Only one thing is necessary; it is the living faith that inspires the person who receives it to believe with all his heart what he has heard. That the life of the one who teaches is reprehensible, will it be an obstacle for the one who listens? Will it prevent him

from believing in the truths he teaches, and will the sin of the master enter the disciple's heart to close him to faith? Or will God, who is righteous, disdain a man who is devoted to him because of the sin of him whom he bears to see in dignity? But the man himself does not judge it in this way, although he is often deceived or likes to please. If it were so, and man was obliged to defend his cause, would he not have the right to say to God: I do not know him who is the cause of the scorn you show me? It is to find that I approached him because he was your priest; it is you that I have sought, you whom I have desired, you who have believed; I have not expected anything from the man, why should I be responsible for the bad dispositions of a man whom I would not have known if I had not looked for you? If his virtues had been useful to me, it might perhaps be fair to say that his vices were hurtful to me. But no, the virtues would not have served me anything if my faith had been doubtful, and I have nothing to do with it to fear his vices. Now, my faith is what it must be; I have faith in teachings that come from you, that make you love, that speak about you and your promises; neither his speeches nor his actions have been the motive or the object of my faith, but it is to the faith that comes from you that I have given myself entirely. According to these principles, the conduct of the true faithful is irreproachable. Suppose the priests are lawyers, will the bad life of a lawyer be a cause of conviction for his client? The duty of the lawyer is to defend the cause of his client according to the rules of law; but how unjust is his life, how can it harm the cause he supports? The lawyer's person cannot do good or bad here, the good or bad cause that he defends will determine the judgment that will be made. It is the same with those who want to become Christians, they come to find the priest, express their desires to him, and he gives them the teachings prescribed by the rules of the Church; if these desires are true, the judge welcomes them; in what way can the priest here be useful or harmful, while he does not even know the cause of his client? God, who is his judge, is the only one who knows what he is, in what arrangements he approaches him. The duty of the priest is to fulfill here the office entrusted to him, that of the judge, to welcome or reject the cause of his client. Is it not he who said in the Gospel, "My daughter, did your faith save you?" (Matt. 9:22) So it is not to any foreign help whatsoever, it is to the faith that the salvation of each one is attached, because God has established that faith, if it is firm, would get everything he wanted. You, on the contrary, come not as a friend, but as an enemy of Christ to gather the people under

your name; they cannot be Christians if they are not Novatians, while the Apostle condemns those who say they belong to Paul or to another. But you, who believe you to be superior, place your name above that of Jesus Christ, as if he does not suffice to defend his own Church.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 114. AGAINST THE PAGANS.** — I do not see why the pagans dare to declare war on us, or to attack our faith, while they think themselves safe from all reproach and attack. For they produce no proof in support of assertions, I will say rather of their superstition than of their religion. They affirm things which are nothing less than certain, in order to pass, it seems, for the authors and defenders of new doctrines. In the first place, they claim to adore many gods, and they give no proof, no testimony of their existence. They call gods even those who have not dared to usurp the name, that is to say that are the men who make the gods, while it is God who is the Creator of men, and therefore their assertion is vain and of no weight. Everything that is done outside of God has no stability. The proof of what I say is in their books, where we see God completely alien to their religious institutions. We see men led by different motives, establishing sacrifices in honor of false deities, and thus men without merit were regarded as worthy authors of such institutions. Now, since those whom they call god have not made to them on this point any command, of what authority do they establish, do they present as worthy and commendable a worship which they cannot prove to have been commanded to them? Assuming that they could produce an order they would have received, it would be necessary to examine first of all whether there is an obligation, whether it is expedient to obey those whose divinity cannot be established by any sign, by no wonder. Beaten on this point, they take refuge in the elements and claim that they are the object of their worship, because their influence is all powerful in the direction of human life. Here again I will ask them, as before, whether they have received an order, a commandment from God, of which they themselves confess grandeur and power, although they take no account of it. If one owes a cult to the elements, it is necessary that this cult was commanded by the one that one recognizes for the creator of the elements. If they

cannot produce this order, it is a reckless presumption, and a presumption worthy of punishment rather than reward; for it is a contempt for the Creator that the servants receive the homage that is refused to their master, and that the people of the emperor's suite are made to adore the contempt of the emperor himself. How can they hope for impunity here, whereas in this very life we see this audacity severely punished? Will they say that they have received the order of the elements themselves? Let them show this order and tell us the words that these elements would have addressed to them. Now, if they cannot produce this order, what punishments are not worthy of the proven authors of this religion of presumption and falsehood? We cannot attribute this impiety to the elements. The stars of the body will accuse them of God's tribunal, declaring that they have by no means been the authors of this impious and vain inspiration. In the same way, when those who are only men and whom they call gods will be delivered to the just punishments which their sins deserve, they will maintain that they are not guilty of anything here, and will lay all the responsibility for this crime of idolatry on those who, without having received the order, began to render them divine honors. How dare they attack our faith, treat it as an object of mockery, as they see our law supported by irreconcilable testimony, and read this statement of Our Lord Himself and our God: "I am the Lord, and there are no others." (Isa. 45:6) If he had been content with this statement, we could have refused to believe it so as not to resemble the pagans who, without seeing any proof of the power of their gods, worshiped them and, what is worse, rendered them an unholy cult. We blush to reveal the shameful things that are done there, and they call themselves wise, because their law plays them as an impostor. As for our God he commanded men to worship him, but after giving proof of his power, and to leave them no doubt, he gave them a pure law, holy and worthy of God. For us the pagans are foolish, we would not have believed in our God, if He had not given us testimonies of His power, and we would not have received His law if we had not recognized that it was pure and worthy of our obedience. So nothing in us is done in darkness or in secret. For all that is honest does not fear publicity; what shudders decency and virtue is ashamed to happen in the open. That is why pagans celebrate their mysteries in darkness, and in this they all act of prudence. They blush to face the jeers of the public, and they do not want to divulge the abominations they perform as one of the prescriptions of their law, for fear that these men who call themselves

wise do not pass for extravagant in the eyes of those whom they accuse of madness. Perhaps, in fact, they regard us as foolish, because our law preaches chastity, mercy, piety, continence, all things that are so extravagant to them, for every virtuous man passes for bad in the eyes of the wicked, and the prudent the man is accused of madness by the fool. Chastity is so much in their horror that the degenerate are their delights, they take them for masters, and they are not worthy of their religion, if I may give it that name, so long as they become like them. That is why they submit to the operation of castration and change their habit as to change their sex, they lend themselves to unnatural actions, like women, and only then are they worthy and perfect ministers of their superstition. Can one accuse someone who becomes such only by virtue of his law? He renounces the prerogatives and the clothing of the man and transforms himself into a woman to lend himself in all pride to womanish actions. What must we think of these mysteries, which change honesty in reverse and innocence into corruption, while true religion replaces in men indecency by modesty and licentiousness by modesty? How can the partisans of this religion be virtuous when the mysteries of their law can be celebrated only in the company of the womanish men? If their law allows these disorders, and has them pleasant, it is crime, it is folly to refuse to take part. So they treat us as foolish, for the wise in their eyes are those who practice this filthy cult and the foolish who flee with horror. And it is here that they show fineness and deceptions. They decorate their law with the name of wisdom to cover all that is reprehensible, because the blame cannot fall on the wisdom. They treat, on the contrary, our law of madness to drive away men. But leave aside these names of wisdom and madness; let us repress this spirit of rivalry which the defense of two opposing parties always engenders, and put the two laws in the presence of one another so that we can clearly see where wisdom is, where madness is. What! the sign of the cross alone imposes silence on paganism. In the presence of what they call a madness, their wisdom is silent, their victims dare not answer. Their entrails remain silent and mute out of respect for the majesty of the Christian religion. Is it not a wonder that what they decorate with the name of wisdom trembles before what they treat of madness? Let us now compare the very content of these two laws. The pagans admit in their writings that they adore gods and goddesses, and they say true, because they render divine honors to divinities of both sexes. Janus and Saturn, Jupiter and Mercury, Apollo, etc.; on the other hand, Minerva, Isis,

Fruxilla, Venus, Flora the courtesan, etc. are as many gods and goddesses as the stories of the Greeks and Romans attest. The Christians whom they treat as fools are less rich; they adore in the mystery of divinity only one God, the principle of all things, and they grant divine honors to none of the things he created. They are convinced that it alone and amply suffices for salvation, and they know that they outrage it by attributing to others its glory and its name; and indeed, no sovereign allows one to confound with him his tribunes and his officers. Now compare these two laws; where is wisdom here? in the law that adores the Creator or the one who adores the creature? in the law which prostrates itself only before the Lord, or in that which prostitutes the divine honors to his servants? Can it be that in a house there are two masters? and how can pagans, versed in judicial expertise, and who claim to be wise men, in the same world created by one and the same God, adore an infinite number of gods and goddesses? They give the name of gods to those who rule and govern the world, whereas they do not believe in providence. Now, the pronouncement of a wicked doctrine is an act of improvidence and madness. God must necessarily avenge his outraged glory against those who dare to attribute to their fellow-creatures the name and prerogatives of the Godhead. Let's move on to what each of these laws says. Our law, which they treat as foolish, makes it a duty to choose for pontiffs and altar ministers only men of pure manners, of a holy and irreproachable life; the tradition of the pagans, on the other hand, requires that one be fit to become priests and ministers of their divinities only on the condition that men become women, in order to be able to lend themselves more freely to feminine acts. This is how we see them shake their hair indecently in the bath, and make an angry voice sound, hail and dissolute. If they dared to commit themselves in public to these excesses, they would be stoned by all the people. And what about that Cynocephalus (Anubis) who is always wandering and who seeks in every place the scattered members of the adulterous Osiris, husband of Isis? It is with such ministers, it is in the school of such masters that these pagans dare to adorn themselves with the name of sages, whereas far from finding in them the shadow of wisdom, we meet only the crime. Nothing is more fatal, indeed, than to love the obscenities and depravities of vice. What shall I say of the shameful scenes which take place in the caves where they hide their eyes? To escape from the shame of the obscenities with which the blistering is printed on them, they are blindfolded; some flap their wings like birds, imitating the voice of the raven, others sound the

roar of lions; others, hands tied with the intestines of young horses, are thrown on pits full of water; one of them approaches with a sword, cuts the knots formed by these intestines, and proclaims himself their liberator. Other actions are more obscene yet. See how degrading depravities are the victim of these men who decree the name of wise men. Because these shameful scenes are accomplished in the shadows, they imagine that they cannot be known. But the holy Christian faith has revealed and brought to light all those mysteries of iniquity that vicious and degraded men have invented and accomplished in secret. When this faith was preached, those who heard it, delighted with this doctrine of virtue and holiness, hastened to embrace it and to abandon these secret mysteries of shame and disgrace, they confessed that they had been the victim of ignorance. Almost all of them were victims of this guilty error, and they looked at each other as wise, because there was no one who took them back. For although all were deceived in the deceitful ways of the same idolatry, however, each had made a cult adapted to his tastes and his habits, so that one and the same mistake took different forms, according to the customs and the immoral life of those who established it. Thus the called mysteries of Bacchus are the triumph of pessimism and shame joined to the excesses of fury. Fornication, indeed, rarely goes without anger; everywhere else with Bacchus we see represented Priapus, with whom he had an infamous commerce. All other mysteries are of the same kind, but Satan used his ordinary finesse and tricks to catch men in these shameful nets. It was already under his inspiration that men had established these unclean mysteries; but when they were established, he overlaid them with certain prestige calculated to seduce men and lead them into error. Thus the tradition of antiquity served as a passport to lies, and an excuse for these shameful inventions. By force of habit, we no longer consider as shameful what was the height of shame. In fact, a first outrage makes one blush, but the habit imperceptibly softens the repulsive features of vice, and the forehead becomes hardened to shame, especially if one is surrounded by a large number of accomplices. Indeed, it is a conquest for shame when it manages to imprint its stain on individuals of distinction that easily find imitators. If for so many centuries they have been able to cover themselves with the name of sages, because there was no voice to condemn these overwhelming inventions; today, that thanks to the mercy of God, light has been made for the human race, that it condemns as a crime what was then regarded as a law, and presents to men as true wisdom what then it was

a madness, they should stop wearing this name, give up persevering in infamies that are brought to light, and recognize that they are unworthy of the name of wise. But, on the contrary, to put the finishing touch to their folly of which they are convinced, they continue to treat fools who expose their extravagance. They accuse our faith and its late appearance on earth; as for the precepts imposed on us, they admit that they are irreproachable. But the accusation they make against our faith is less against us than against its divine author. They call us foolish for believing unreasonable things, and they accuse of falsehood, deceit, and imposture God who has given us faith, so they say, to throw us into error. Let us prove to them, Christians, that it is not without reason that we have believed, and we will then defend the cause of the author of our faith. When we lived in the error in which the Gentiles are still today, we have learned what they call their sacred dogmas by simple words which no miraculous sign has confirmed; we looked upon it as useful in this doctrine, not what the Divinity had revealed, but the tradition of an ancient custom, and having been the plaything of a thousand vain illusions, we have recognized, which is no mystery to anyone that it contains no hope of salvation. What usefulness could be in fact a doctrine which was a pure invention of men? For us, on the contrary, we have been led to believe in God and his Son incarnate and crucified, not by speeches but by facts. We have seen resurrected dead, purified lepers, the eyes of a blind-born open to light, demons driven out, and all diseases healed. Now let us be told when we were mad, when we believed in mere words, or when we only wanted to believe on facts? There is no doubt that the facts preceded the words, since the latter were put into use only to express the facts. If, then, without the testimony of any prodigy we have believed in a human tradition which has been invented only to seduce the spirits of men, how much more must we believe a doctrine of which miracles which can only have God for author, demonstrate the divinity? Would we not rightly pass for fools, if we refused to believe the testimonies of divine power, after having believed in mere speeches? Would not our conduct be at once improvident and inconsiderate, if we reject the call that hope makes us after voluntarily following a doctrine without hope? They object to us that the object of our faith is absurd. It is contrary to reason, they say, that God has a Son, and that bodies that are victims of death and dissolution can come back to life again. All the philosophers and the authors of various sects fought each other by means of contradictory discussions, without any of them

having ever embraced another sect, because each one wanted to stay in the one that had indoctrinated him. These contradictory discussions made victory impossible. No one could prove that he was victorious; they got tired of this conflict of opposing doctrines, but never succeeded in persuasion. That is why the providence of God, whose designs are impenetrable, has resolved to join miracles to preaching, so that the truth of preaching may be confirmed by the irrefutable testimonies of divine power, and to silence the contradiction that would have failed to attack the doctrine. What more convincing proof of the truth than the operation of miracles? Now, if one insists against these miracles by denying the reliability of the Scriptures, how can one accuse our faith of madness, since we do not admit the testimony of the Scriptures? For in the same books where it is written of Jesus Christ that we must believe that He is the Son of God, we find these testimonies of the divine power. Will anyone say that it is an absurdity that Jesus Christ the Son of God has been crucified, that he will continue reading these sacred books, and he will find that he is risen from the dead, and he will understand that it is neither without reason nor against his will that Christ is dead, since he has been able to resurrect, but that there is a mystery here. Whatever may be the contradiction, then, he will cease to speak of the cross, because if he treats it as madness, he cannot treat the resurrection in the same way, for the resurrection serves as a defense to the cross; or if he tries to speak of the cross, he will not be able to deny Divine providence manifested in it, and that he sees confirmed by the testimony of the resurrection, for these two facts must be accepted, or both of them rejected in such a way that the prosecution is rendered impossible as the defense. But why did the Son of God allow himself to be tied to a cross? It is a mystery whose explanation is reserved for members of his family. He speaks of this death in such elevated terms, that he declares that it is the principle of his glory. "I have the power," he says, "to give my life, and I have the power to take it back." (Jn. 10:18) So he was not forced to die, because he had the power to die and to resurrect. Anyone who disputes this power, cannot say that he has been the victim of a violent death, because if he denies this power, he can no longer assert that he is dead, since there is no mention of this power only in the book where we read that he was delivered to death. No one can condemn the last events by those who precede, nor the first by those who follow, for there can be no contradiction in facts which belong to one and the same body of doctrine. As for the resurrection of the dead, they do not

speak sincerely, saying that it is a folly to believe in it, for they have before them examples which make it credible to them. Do not all the seeds necessary for the life of man begin to dissolve and die before being reborn to life? If this is the order God has established for things that are for the use of men, why treat fools who believe that God follows the same course for their bodies? But they are themselves foolish in refusing to God the power which they are obliged to recognize in the world; for the time of these great acts of power has not yet come, and here we see only the shadow. This is where God wanted the seed of faith to grow in hearts. Yet we see that the only invocation of the cross strikes the demons of terror, and if it is repeated it puts them to flight; and the gods of the pagans, trembling and fearful in the name alone of the cross, dare no longer render their oracles. If the death of Jesus Christ is a reproach, why does it imprint terror? A death that is the punishment of a crime must be an object of contempt rather than fear. Who dares to fear a man put to death for his crimes? Even if he were innocent, we feel sorry for him, but we do not fear him. If, therefore, the demons and gods of the Gentiles did not feel that the cross of Jesus Christ contained a mystery, his name alone would not strike them with terror, and to tell the whole truth they would not tremble in front of him if they were not guilty; for all who stand with the demonic party have been accomplices in the death of Jesus Christ. That is why the only name of the cross inspires fear and terror to all the demons or false deities of the nations. For every man who has taken part in the death of an innocent man cannot hear his name without his heart being full of terror. Remembering his crime, he sees how guilty he is. How much more are the demons or the gods of the nations, who are the perpetrators of the death of the Lord and Savior of the world? But the Gentiles claim to possess the truth as seniority; what has priority, they say, cannot be false; as if seniority or a custom that dates back far enough to form a privilege favorable to the truth. Then the homicides, the eminences, the adulterers, all those who are guilty of other vices could as such defend their crimes, because they have for them the antiquity and go back to the origin of the world. It is, on the contrary, what should convince them of their error, because we find an evil beginning to what is guilty and ashamed, whereas what is honest and holy has always been honored as it deserved, and it is impossible that vice preceded virtue. In the end, it cannot be denied that the religion of the Gentiles is of human invention, while it is evident that ours has God as author. The majesty of God was manifested on the mountain

to give the law to men; and to render it more worthy of faith, he preceded it by a multitude of miracles and wonders wrought in Egypt, and which are still attested today by the books which Ptolemy has preserved in the library of Alexandria. God deigned to give his law with such an imposing device that no one could doubt that he was the author. The majesty of God was publicly revealed to all eyes with so much brilliancy and with circumstances so apt to inspire terror that it was impossible not to believe that he was the only God and that men should observe this that he commanded them. And to convince you that everything here is worthy of divine wisdom, examine this law and see if it prescribes anything contrary to justice, decency, or simply ridicule. This is how God had to make himself known. He who cannot be constrained by any space should not appear in a place ignored as an impostor, nor as in a mirror or by a deceptive mirage, where we see something other than what exists, and the precepts he imposed were not to be performed in darkness to cover what they had contrary to decency and virtue. The knowledge of one God was erased in the world under the multiplicity of the crimes of men; the lie had covered the truth with a veil; it was then that God, in his clemency and mercy, unwilling to let his work perish, deigned to visit mankind. He did not appear as those who took the title of gods, but he manifested himself as the truth of God to destroy the error that had corrupted the minds of men by the preaching of the plurality of the gods. The six hundred thousand or more men who had come out of Egypt saw and recognized that it was the God who is above all to the extraordinary brightness of his ineffable glory (Exod. 20:18); They feared to approach him and worshiped him from afar in the ground. New wonders, different from those he had wrought in Egypt, made known to all by their divine character that he was the one and only God. The knowledge of these wonders spread among all peoples, they were an object of terror for the neighboring nations. What have the like made of the gods of the nations? In what country, to what people have they manifested their glory? What miracles, what prodigies have they performed as proofs of their divinity? In what place, in what time did they make their voices heard? A foolish people has begun to render divine honors to fantastic shades, to demons, to the images of the dead, and this worship, having become habituated by a usage of several centuries, claims to make a title for it to support that it is the truth. Now, the truth does not come from the custom, which is itself the result of an old custom, but of God, who makes himself recognized as God not by his antiquity, but by his

eternity. So faith is not a thing that begins, it is strictly speaking without beginning. When we believe in God, we begin to believe; as to the object of our faith, it is eternal. How then can the pagans boast of being before us, since what is the object of their worship came only after God? Is the work not after the craftsman? The pagans adore the works, we adore the author of these works; they worship the creature, we worship the Creator. Did God, who certainly created the world, not make himself known to men by this creation? Shall we say that he has made man and that he does not want the homage of him whom he has created? It's an absurdity. Hardly out of the hands of God, man adored his Creator, because in this way he demanded reason and justice. The worship of the true God having been weakened on the earth by the negligence of men, God renewed it in the person of Abraham so that the knowledge of God which had been given to Adam began again in Abraham, that his children were raised in this knowledge, that it perpetuated without interruption and that there were always on the earth men who adored the true God. The foreign peoples themselves were called to this knowledge of God. Thus, the subject who knows how to begin, the object that is known is above all beginning. On what grounds do pagans thus rely to pretend that their religion is older than ours? If the world is anterior to God (which we cannot admit), paganism is anterior to Christianity. It is not the name of religion that adores a single God in the mystery of the Trinity. That the name of Christ comes from *chrisma* (unction), we must always recognize that the reason of the name is before the anointing. In our fathers, those who received the royal anointing were called Christs and bore the image of Christ to come, who was born of God the Father to be king and to bear the name of Christ rightly; for birth gave him what anointing gives to the kings of the earth. As long as the pagans do not know this truth, they reject it; but as soon as they know her, they embrace her fervently, and rejoice at having passed from falsehood to truth and evil. If they have, with all their enthusiasm, supported babbles and nonsense, we see them deploy a force, a much greater passion, to sustain the truth. What, then, is our Christ, whom we hate only when we do not know him, and cannot help loving when we know him? For the wicked, on the contrary, we love them when we do not know them, and we hate them as soon as we know them. How many who, in the past, had hatred for Christ and who love him today, and who regret having been able to hate what they did not know? One thing that one does not know is always foolish, for one must first of all see if it

deserves the hatred one bears to it. Those who are fighting our religion today will be tomorrow's defenders and will regret bitterly for knowing the truth too late. If it were really worthy of hatred, or if it contained some deception, every day Christians would return to paganism. But on the contrary, because it is the truth, every day and at any time the Gentiles, and among them the wise and the noble of this world, abandon the worship of Jupiter, whom they recognized as god, to come running to Jesus Christ, to whom belongs honor and glory for ever and ever.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 125. AGAINST EUSEBIUS.** — I remember having read earlier in a booklet composed by Eusebius, a character of an otherwise remarkable doctrine, that the Holy Spirit had not known the mystery of the birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and I am sure that such a great man has dared to advance such an unworthy opinion for the Holy Spirit; for it is thereby declaring that he is inferior to God. It cannot be said, indeed, that it comes from God if he does not know the things of God (Jn. 10:30), because an inferior nature does not know the properties of a superior nature. If, on the contrary, he has the same nature, the same divinity, how can he ignore things that are of his nature? The Son of God after saying, "My Father and I are one," (Jn. 10:30) to establish the unity of nature between his Father and him, adds with reason: "All that belongs to my Father is mine, and all that belongs to me is to my Father." (Jn. 16:15) If, then, the Holy Spirit has the same divinity, why refuse him the same knowledge while granting him the same nature? You grant him the essential prerogative, and you dispute that which is secondary. The creature learns, and by its actions begins to know some truths about its author, and these truths are common to him, but nature and divinity can never be common between God and the creature. The divine nature has nothing to learn, because there is nothing it does not know; human nature, on the contrary, does not have knowledge as an essential property, it must learn. Knowledge, then, adds to, but does not change, human nature, for man does not possess science by virtue of his nature, he was created to acquire knowledge by his labor. Substance is therefore superior to knowledge, for it is not knowledge that acquires substance, but substance that acquires knowledge; we can, moreover, suppose the substance

without knowledge, but not knowledge without substance. In God, on the contrary, knowledge is equal to substance, for the substance which has nothing to learn is itself its knowledge. That's why everything in God is substantial. The substance that nothing lacks possesses everything substantially, because the learning cannot add anything to it. How then can one say of the Holy Spirit that he does not know the birth of the Son of God if he is consubstantial with him? Is knowledge and ignorance compatible in one and the same substance? It is certain that the Son of God did not learn the mystery of his birth, he knows it by virtue of his nature and not by learning; What reason is there for saying that the Holy Spirit does not know, since he himself does not need to learn anything because he knows everything by his nature? Like the Son of God, the Holy Spirit is the substance of God, according to these words of the Savior: All that is to my Father is mine, words which signify that His substance is the same as the substance of God the Father. He also teaches us that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from what is his. "For this reason," he says, "he will receive from what is mine, because all that belongs to my Father is mine." If he proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son, how can he ignore the birth of the Son, since his substance is the very substance of the Son? For all that is to the Father is to the Son; therefore, without a doubt, the substance of the Father is in the Holy Spirit. In fact, the Son added: "And all that is mine is mine Father." Why then doubt that the Holy Spirit has the same divinity, since he has the same nature? Our Lord does not declare that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, as He proceeds from Himself? And to prevent any other interpretation: and He proceeds from the Father, he says, "and will receive from what is mine." (Jn. 15:26, 16:14) That is, for the Holy Spirit to proceed from the Father is to receive from what is Christ Jesus. We say that he receives from what is the Son of God, and by the same we affirm that he is of God, and that the Spirit certainly possesses the substance and divinity of the Father. He who therefore claims that he does not know the birth of the Son of God is an insult to him from whom the Holy Spirit has received. For he receives nothing but the very nature of the one who receives, since to receive from what is to Jesus Christ is to proceed from God; he cannot therefore ignore what he knows from whom he has received what he is, he cannot ignore the Lord, since he proceeds from God. The Son of God, by the same thing that He comes from God the Father, knows all things of God; why then deny that the Spirit knows all that pertains to Jesus Christ, since he

has received from him what he is? If therefore the Son of God knows what is in God, no doubt that the Holy Spirit also knows what is in the Son of God, and if he knows what is in the Son, why say that he does not know what is in the Son, who is in God? He whom he receives gives him the knowledge of God. But why so many reasonings? Does not the Apostle testify to this truth when he says, "Nobody knows what is in God, except the Spirit of God?" (1 Cor. 2:11) This is the goal of our efforts attained with the aid of this testimony of the Apostle. Now, this statement that no one knows what is in God except the Spirit of God, does it harm the Son of God? Just as the Son in no way prejudices the rights of the Holy Spirit when he says, "No one knows the Father, except the Son." (Matt. 11:27) He declares that no one knows what is in God, except that which is of God, for all that is of God knows God, and that which is in God. The nature of God knows Himself, and as you are obliged to recognize this nature in the Holy Spirit, by that alone that it proceeds from the Father and that he has received from the Son, he would be reckless to say that he does not know God the Father whose nature you recognize in him. And yet the Savior declares that no one knows God the Father, except the Son, but he reserves to another person the secret of this knowledge, immediately adding, "And he to whom the Son willed to reveal it." Whom does the Son want to reveal this truth? No one can be more intimate or dearer to him than his Spirit, because, says the Apostle: "He who does not have the Spirit of Jesus Christ is not his." (Rom 8:9) How then do you think that God the Father was revealed to the Holy Spirit by the Son, if not in the way the Lord Himself indicates to us by these words: "He will receive from me?" In fact, God the Father cannot be revealed to a mere creature, for to be able to bear the knowledge of the divine nature, we must have this same nature, since God dwells in a light inaccessible to all creatures. (1 Tim. 6:16) But there are some who maintain as reasonable the feeling of this who claim that the Holy Spirit has not known the mystery of the birth of the Son of God, because it is written of him that he scrutinizes all things (1 Cor. 2:10), and that to scrutinize is a clue that one does not know. But this expression must be understood by other similar places. Thus we see in Scripture that God says, "I, God, I search the loins and the hearts," (Jer. 17:10) and in a psalm: "God scrutinizes hearts and loins;" (Ps. 2:10) and the Apostle himself says, "He who searches the hearts knows what are the desires of the Spirit, because he asks for the saints what is according to God." (Rom. 8:27) It can be seen from these examples that the Holy

Spirit is not to be seen as synonymous with ignorance, but also that he is scrutinizing the depths of God, and what are those depths of God that he is probing. To scrutinize the hidden things, means to enter here, so that it does not remain unknown to him. The deep mysteries of God are the inner mysteries of the divinity which cannot be scrutinized by the creature. We still read that the Holy Spirit request according to the will of God for the saints what the saints do not know at the testimony of the Apostle: "For we do not know what we must ask of God in prayer." (Rom. 8:26) To know the deep secrets of God and to know his will are therefore two synonymous things. Indeed, what mystery deeper than the will of God, known mystery of the Holy Spirit and unknown to all others? It is necessary to examine, in fact, what is the meaning of these words: "Who among men knows what is in man, but the spirit of the man who is in him?" The mind is here taken for the soul, because in fact no one knows what is in the soul of man, except his soul which is his spirit. In the same way, no one knows the things of God, except the Spirit of God, that is to say God himself, for he who is of God can only be understood as God himself. The Spirit of God knows what is in God because he is of God. If, in fact, no one knows God's thoughts, how much more can no one know the secrets and the will of God, if he is not of God, that is to say, if he God himself, for God is known only from Him alone. To speak even exactly there is no thought in God. God does not discuss in himself what he must do or not do, deliberating whether it is useful to act, for all that is in God exists in a certain way not by accident, but substantially not as a result of learning, but by virtue of its nature, because he is immutable. The Holy Spirit knows the mysteries of God only in virtue of his nature, for the same nature must have the same thought, the same will. He speaks of God who is always one and immutable, whether in the Son or in the Holy Spirit. What the Father wants, the Son wants, too, and what the Son wants, the Holy Spirit also wants. This is why he is sometimes called the Spirit of God, sometimes the Spirit of Jesus Christ. He proceeds from God, says the Savior, and he will receive from what is mine. That is why the Apostle St. John says: "It is the Spirit He has given us that we know that God dwells in us." (1 Jn. 3:24) If then when the Spirit of God is in us, they say that God abides in us; the Spirit of God is here God himself. Besides, it is the sign for the faithful that they are the children of God, and it is after having received the Holy Spirit that they dare proclaim themselves the children of God. If they do not have this divine sign, they cannot

be entitled to the name of children of God. Let us say, however, that no one can be the true Son of God in the sense that he would come wholly from God, considered in all the extent of his nature, like Christ. It is through adoption that Christians become the children of God. The Spirit of Jesus Christ that they receive gives them the right to be called the children of God, because this Spirit they have in them comes from God. In even adoptive children one must at least partly find the nature of the father. In the world where things are flawed, those who are adopted by men do not receive any proof of their adoption, except for the name they bear. But God, perfection itself, does more; he shares with his adopted sons his Spirit, which gives the adoption a true certainty, for the names without things are meaningless. The Apostle comes to the support of our feeling when he exclaims, "O depth of the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God, how incomprehensible are his judgments, and his ways impenetrable!" (Rom. 11:33) But how is it that he says elsewhere that the depths of God is to say the secrets can be probed, while he declares here that they are impenetrable? The Apostle in this place wants to speak about the creature for whom the secrets or the judgments of God are really impenetrable. But for the Holy Spirit who knows all things of God, he declares that he can search all that is in God, and affirms that the Spirit of God cannot ignore what remains unknown to the creature. We cannot deny the nature of God; he necessarily knows what is inaccessible to the creature. Those who give the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, an inferior rank, shake the divine decree which makes the salvation of all men dependent on the mystery of the divine Trinity, for if the Holy Spirit is not consubstantial to God and to Christ, it is ridiculous to place him in the same rank as the Father and the Son, and to say that without him no one can claim either to salvation or to the God-givenness of a child of God. If he does not have the same divinity, it is a folly to affirm it, or a gratuitous concession made to it, which God forbid! What a little wise spirit will dare to argue that the creature may be placed in the same rank as the Creator, the Lord to be likened to him who has a beginning, the Lord equal to the servant, the mighty confounded with him who has no power, the one who knows everything with the one who lacks knowledge? It is time to put an end to this slanderous accusation. The Holy Spirit is the third in order of enumeration and not by nature; by the rank which we give him, and not by his divinity as the third divine person, and not because he has not all knowledge. Just as the Son comes second after the Father, without being inferior to him in

divinity, so the Holy Spirit comes after the Son, without being inferior to him; on the contrary, he has with him the same nature, the same divinity. All that we read of the Son of God, we also read from the Holy Spirit to the testimony of the Son of God himself. It is he who says in effect: "I will pray to my Father, and he will give you another Comforter, the Spirit of truth. (Jn. 1:16) Saying: Another comforter, he teaches us that he himself is a comforter. St. John teaches us the same truth when he says that the Son of God intercedes for our sins. (1 Jn. 2:2) And the Apostle St. Paul says of the Holy Spirit: "The Spirit of God asks for us." (Rom. 8:26) As you can see, Scripture presents them both as our advocates near God. Our Lord still calls him the Spirit of truth, and thereby shows that he is in all likeness to him who said, "I am the truth." (Jn. 14:6) He declares that he was sent by his Father, and he promises to send the Holy Spirit, and if he is not inferior to the Father who sends him, the Holy Spirit is not inferior to the Son by whom he is sent. These three distinct persons are not like each other's members each having different attributions, they all have the same power, without any of them being anything less than another. To finish this question, for we have already discussed it more thoroughly in the booklet which we have composed against the impiety of the Arians, in which we have embraced all that relates to the indivisible unity of the Trinity.

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 1. AGAINST THOSE WHO DENY THAT GOD IS INTERESTED IN THE ACTIONS OF MEN.** — There are many that the darkness of this world have blinded and cannot suffer to see us watch with scrupulous vigilance the commandments of God, flee the opportunities of sin, apply us with a holy zeal to the practice of all good works remain insensitive to seductive charms and the charms of vices, to be superior to all the false pleasures of the world, willingly and courageously to bear all the pains, all torments for the name of God, to despise death itself by the power of the mind. They are those to whom all human thoughts have persuaded that none of the actions of life are worthy of praise or blame. They do not want God to be interested in any way. It is even who, in order to defend their faults and their crimes, go so far as to say: It is useless to live well or gravely,

for God has no concern to consider attentively the various actions you do under the inspiration of your particular desires, good or bad, and to rest your eyes on some of your acts, sometimes very humiliating. All the actions that men do according to their desires are vain. He who is united with God remains isolated and separated from all human things; he is not irritated, he is not moved by anything; he does not stop to consider any of the events, any of the actions of the life of men; the rapid course of this world and the inconceivable whirlwind of human changes prevail and carry it so far that one must be regarded as a fool by claiming that one can be the object of the particular providence of God. The martyrs themselves, who celebrate the mercy of God and believe him to be pleasing by shedding their blood for him, are in error. Nothing in us is agreeable or obnoxious to him; he is indifferent to the miseries of our mortal condition as well as to that which can contribute to his happiness; he does not wish to know any of the actions of men, not that it is impossible for his divine majesty to have knowledge of all these past or present actions, but because he wants to remain a stranger to the miseries of men and to the vanities of this world. Is it not written: "Vanity of those who indulge in vanity and all is vanity!" (Eccl. 1:21) This doctrine, which is supported by despair, is fought against and destroyed not only by the authority of the divine oracles, but by the religious language that we usually find on the lips of men. When good and bad faith are in the middle of the business of various profitable dealings, they invoke the testimony of the deity that they claim to know nothing of what we do. I take God to witness, they say; may God see us, may God judge us; May God intervene and take care of justice. And when the oath is recognized as necessary, he who must lend it fears the consequences of perjury, and the oath is required of him in the persuasion that a false oath would not remain without punishment. Have they recovered their health, the object of so many prayers and so many vows, they render to God thanksgiving! Have they escaped an accident that seriously threatened their lives? It is to the goodness of God, they say, that they are indebted to them. And when the unleashed winds upset the sea, lift the waves and come to beat against the shaken sides of the ship, all the passengers raise their hands to heaven, address to God the most urgent supplications, and have the firm hope that he can answer them and deliver them. Now, where does this persuasion come from, if God is completely indifferent to what touches us, and if he completely ignores what we are doing? This doctrine is therefore without foundation; God knows all

things. Let no one, therefore, blame himself that the crimes he has committed will go unpunished. The reward of a holy life is great; his eternal torments are the punishment of a guilty life. To us, therefore, who believe that God knows all things, who runs to martyrdom with holy eagerness, God reserves an inappreciable reward, an eternally happy life; but for the wicked who taught that God knew neither their crimes nor their undisclosed and secret depravities, they have to wait for a devouring fire, and a fire that will not cease to consume them.

## MISCELLANEOUS

### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 1. WHAT IS GOD?** — He is a being that no conception can attain; he is above every word as of every thought. Let us say, however, something which, without being at the height of so great majesty, appears in something less unworthy of God. Every nature conceives of God an idea proportionate to his capacity, and the difference which exists in natures is also found in the thoughts and judgments that we form of God. God above everything must necessarily go beyond the concerns of all created spirits. Men, regardless of the extent of their spirit, see what God is rather by conjecture than by definite definition. The angels, who are superior to men, have of God, without doubt, higher ideas, and for the same reason these thoughts are still more sublime, more extended in the archangels, in the cherubim and the seraphim, spiritual powers more closer to God, without these spirits being able to comprehend fully what God is. For no one knows the Father except the Son, as no one knows the Son except the Father. God is therefore, as he appears to men, a spirit simple in nature, an inaccessible light, invisible, incomprehensible, infinite, perfect, independent, eternal, immortal in all respects, the principle of all things, worthy of veneration, of love, out of fear, beyond which nothing exists, in which are all things that are above or below us, the highest as the lowest, being all-powerful, embracing all, truly rich in all things, because everything comes from him, good, just, merciful. He is good because he gave being to creatures that did not exist. He is just because he has given the use of liberty to the beings whom he has created capable of progress; but as their perfection is not great enough to render them unshakable, he has poured forth into their hearts the seed of the natural law, and he has added the help of a clearly revealed law, which consecrated the rights of his authority, in the eyes of men. He is merciful because he does not punish followers easily but supports them to forgive repentance. He is strict in preserving by a salutary fear his creatures in the kindness he has given them, and in saving them from the abyss into which their negligence precipitates them. And so as not to blame what is more admirable still, his clemency is so great that he bears the outrages of his own creatures and calls them first to be reconciled

with him. Is not this the act of power greater than creation itself? But this excessive goodness, by too much perseverance, could harm the creature. So he wants to inspire sometimes love, sometimes fear to men not to let those who stray away from him perish. It is in order not to expose his patience to contempt which, without reaching it, would turn to our ruin, that he tells us by his prophet: "I have been silent so far, will I always remain silent?" (Isa. 42:14) Thus, God is good, and all that he has done is also good, where does the evil come from? The evil is only the transgression of good that takes place or when forbidden things are done, or when they are used in a disorderly manner from those that are permitted, so that the commandment falls on one object and the sin on another, for example when one uses with a woman of a bad life of the rights which one has only on one's wife, when one offers to the devil that which should be offered only to God, that one seizes not of his good, but of the good of others when, in the end, the innocent is put to death for the guilty, no nature, therefore, essentially approves of evil. The will is an accident of nature, and has its source in causes which may to bear to evil when it wants to go beyond the bounds and engage in acts contrary to its nature. But the causes of prevarication come from the senses when, for example, we see or hear certain things contrary to the established order. And the reason for this error is that man is not God, and God alone is safe from error. Human nature has been left to her free will to do what she wants. If man adds by exercise to the goodness of his nature, he becomes more worthy of honor; if he weakens his natural vigor, he deserves to be punished, for he acts against himself. It is a very important grace given to man that this feeling of joy which he feels when he follows the right path, seeing that his actions make him more perfect, and on the contrary that this interior judgment which makes him to blame himself for not having sought to make himself better by the practice of good works. If man were not master of his actions, he would have been a slave to necessity, he should receive neither the glorious reward of his good deeds, nor the punishment of evil; he would be like animals. God has therefore created us with the faculty or fishing by default of care if we see, if we hear in a bad intention, that is to say contrary to the rule and the reason of the things we had to see and hear for an entirely opposite purpose; or to keep, with the help of vigilance, the good he has put in our nature. However, we cannot always be on our guard, precisely because of this double faculty that is in us; If, then, we fail, we are not immediately condemned, unless we fall back into the same

faults by a sort of treason. Whoever has sinned a first time must immediately guard against the dangers of a new fall, not to become like the one who triumphed over him, and on the contrary to be superior to him by guaranteeing himself of any relapse into sin. A single defeat can thus become the occasion of a double triumph. Justice demands, in fact, that since the present life is a fight, the one who is more strongly solicited to sin should be crowned when he resists temptation. There is nothing wrong with the works of God. If some claim that it is an evil that poison, darkness, because our bodies cannot stand the violence of poison, that they also say that fire or water is an evil, that iron or lead are an evil, because there is a great difference between them and gold. They condemn darkness by comparison with light, although they know that it is necessary in their day, like lead or brick, because it is they who give us rest after work. He who therefore fights generously in this world must oppose the strongest resistance, if he does not want to succumb in the midst of difficult temptations, to be guilty in the eyes of God, to expose himself to the consequences of late or imperfect repentance, to be surprised by death in this state, and come out of this life with his sin. He who bravely resisted, if he comes to be overthrown, falls at least like a man of heart, no one is angry with him, and he himself excites his soul to repair this failure. Everyone sees that his intention was to win, and it is hoped that he will be able to win the more easily that his defeat has cost his enemy more trouble. He, on the other hand, who can easily be conquered, had no intention of resisting. Properly speaking, he is not vanquished, he consents to his defeat. His sin is therefore more serious. He who has vowed to sin can scarcely hope for his forgiveness. On the contrary, he who meditates seriously on the means of avoiding sin is more excusable if he fails; for even the most vigilant, escapes from these faults which are smaller or lighter. Now, the smaller they are, the more imperceptible they are, and the contempt of them prevents them from being avoided. More serious faults appear from a distance. So he who commits them can only accuse his guilty will. We have said above that sins have their source in the senses, when we see or hear something against the commandment of the law or against reason; if, for example, by considering the sun we believe that we should adore it because of its beauty, we see it in a guilty way, because it is outraging the Creator to render to the creature honors that are not owing to him alone, and it is he himself who associates this defense by law. In the same way, if we see bodies whose form equals brightness and beauty, or something

else belonging to the neighbor, we are the object of our desires and we cast upon them defended glances by the law, we commit a sin that is a real evil. Perhaps they will say to me: God was not to give to anybody the beauty in sharing, they would not be for us an occasion of sin, and their disillusionment would be our support, our security. But then iron itself should not exist, since it serves as an instrument for homicides. Why still the lamps that thieves can use for their crimes? That is, the most useful things should be removed for these futile reasons. Is it not obvious that all these objects are still before our eyes without however they always excite our desires? It is not these objects, it is we ourselves who must be accused when we are careless, a sad result of the distance that separates the creature from the Creator. We lend a guilty ear to the speeches which affirm that idols are gods, if we give our consent at the same time, or if we hear obscene songs willingly. On the contrary, we do well to listen, if we experience a real sense of joy when we are told that God is one. He who hears speeches against the law and gives his consent is guilty, and he hurts by listening to them.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 4. WHY DID NOT GOD GIVE THE LAW FROM THE BEGINNING?** — The written law was not to be given first of all, because it is in some way engraved in nature, and the knowledge of the Creator was perpetuated by the tradition of father in sons. Who does not know what the life of a good man requires? who can ignore that he must not do to another what he does not want to be done to himself? But the natural law having come to be weakened by the weight of criminal habits, a clearly revealed law became necessary, and the Jewish people were chosen to make it known to all men. It was not that the natural law was entirely erased, but since it had lost most of its authority, men were left to idolatry. No more fear of God on earth, where the most shameful vices dominated, and where each eagerly coveted the good of his neighbor. It was therefore necessary to give a law which sanctioned the authority of known precepts and made known those who were beginning to darken in the minds of men. Indeed, even before Moses, not only were the precepts of the law not unknown, but the transgression was severely punished. So we find a lot of righteous men who avoided sin, because

they knew that God would not let him go unpunished. This salutary fear of sin having successively diminished, it became necessary to reveal the natural law, to make plainly known to all men that God would ask them for their actions. Divine vengeance, it is true, had been felt by sinners in the flood and ruin of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 7:11, 19:24), but the antiquity of these punishments had made them fall into oblivion. Moses, therefore, thought it his duty to call them to frighten the followers, to urge them to change their lives, and to reform their ideas of God. This is why the Apostle says, "The law is not established for the righteous, but for the unrighteous, for the worshipers of idols, for fornicators, and other sinners alike." (1 Tim. 1:9) Let's see now if the law is in agreement with those who make fun of the judgment of God of which they are threatened, let us see if it is useful or harmful, if it has the truth for support or if it is devoid of reason. In the world, it is true, but we see it without action on many, so it is not right that those who sin here, by abusing their power, enjoy peace and security. Elsewhere, we see the laws mocked, the poor oppressed, the just victims of unjust accusations, the people well covered with contempt, the pious men in poverty, the wicked in prosperity, the iniquity in the honors, miseries and captors in riches, the justice of a shameful traffic. Would it not be an injustice for the Creator of the world to let such disorders go unpunished? No, it must rise, let it glorify the victims of an unjust oppression, and reward those whose virtue has gathered down here only hardships, that it honors those who have been covered with contempt for justice. As for those who, by an unjust abuse of their power, have despised the laws, or have made use of them by their ploys, partisans of the iniquity of which pride and arrogance are a real insult to justice, they must be humiliated, confounded, and delivered to the torture in the presence of the just whom they have enjoyed humbling and persecuting, and who, in a real feeling of joy, will thus give thanks to God who does not accept people (Rom 2:11), punishments of their oppressors.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 48. GOD IS UNDOUBTEDLY SUPREMELY PERFECT AND INDEPENDENT OF ALL THINGS; WHAT WAS IT THEN THAT CHRIST THE SAVIOR WAS BORN OF GOD, AND THAT GOD HAD A SON BY**

WHOM HE DID ALL THINGS? — God having resolved to draw from nothing everything that exists, and knowing that this work was in no way connected with his majesty, at first begotten of himself, a simple and incorporeal nature, a Son which was absolutely similar to him, by an act that perfectly matched his greatness. In fact, what could he do more than to engender of himself a being whose perfection was equal to his own? It is the perfect work, and we cannot imagine a more excellent one. All the other works are much inferior; for the higher the Christ is raised above all creatures, the lower their creation is below his generation. Let us say again that God, the principle of all things, wishing to draw creatures from nothingness, at first engendered the Word which was in the mysterious depths of his being, that is to say, he gave it to himself. To this Word he gave the name of Son, to show that it was to him that he should be and that he was consubstantial. The law, by virtue of which children are born of parents, prepared to believe that generation which revealed to men the mystery which was hidden in God from all eternity.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT
<b>QUESTION 83.</b> IF IT IS THROUGH JESUS CHRIST THAT WE HAVE SALVATION, THE TRUE AND PERFECT KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, WHY DID NOT HE COME SOONER SO THAT OUR FATHERS WHO WERE IN IGNORANCE SHOULD LEARN THE TRUTH? SINCE THE ADVENT OF CHRIST, MEN HAVE BEEN SAVED IN FAR GREATER NUMBERS THAN BEFORE. IF, THEREFORE, HE HAD COME EARLIER, THE NUMBER OF THE ELECT WOULD HAVE BEEN MUCH GREATER. IT IS THEREFORE REPREHENSIBLE NOT TO HAVE DONE SO. — He who does an act of mercy must be safe	<b>QUESTION 58.</b> IF JESUS IS FOR US THE AUTHOR OF SALVATION AND THE TRUE AND PERFECT KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, WHY DID HE NOT COME BEFORE, SO THAT THOSE WHO HAVE LIVED BEFORE US IN IGNORANCE MAY KNOW THE TRUTH? SINCE THE ADVENT OF JESUS CHRIST, MEN HAVE BEEN SAVED IN FAR GREATER NUMBERS THAN BEFORE; IF HE HAD COME EARLIER, HE WOULD HAVE ADDED TO THE NUMBER OF THE ELECT. SO THERE IS SOMETHING HERE THAT LEAVES SOMETHING TO BE DESIRED. — If one comes to the aid

from accusation. As soon as he gives, he is free to show mercy when and as much as he pleases. He can no doubt be prayed to, bowed down with prayers, but he must never be distracted by the discussion of the good works he wishes to do. Perhaps it would be less contradicted if his mercy was less gratuitous. Do we condemn a doctor who offers free remedies and care? Will not those who have not thought of taking advantage of it accuse him of his negligence? We speak here according to the light of reason, but the goodness of the Savior is not directed by these considerations because of human weakness. So he came when he had to come, and he obeyed the decrees of his will, more than the voice of our merits. If you examine here the merits, he had no reason to come. He came down when he saw that it was time to come to our aid, and that the grace of redemption would be understood and appreciated. If you hasten to help him who is threatened with danger, he will no doubt be grateful to you; but he will not appreciate what he has done for him; but if you come to his aid at the height of danger, he will understand the full extent of the service you render him. The extreme danger to which you have snatched it will inspire the most ardent thanksgiving. It is as if you would give bread to a hungry man; if you turn it on the contrary to him who does not feel this need, his recognition will be less lively. So the Lord has very

of a man by diverting from him a danger which threatens him, he will undoubtedly be grateful, but he will not be able to appreciate the service rendered to him. If, on the contrary, you come to his aid in the height of danger, he will understand the full extent of the benefit to which he is the object. The deliverance of so severe a test will inspire him a livelier recognition. It will be like giving bread to a man who is tormented by hunger. If, on the contrary, you give it to him who does not feel this need, what gratitude will you bear with it? Our Lord therefore acted very wisely, not coming sooner to the earth; he has first let the human race behave according to his will; but he did not remain without witness, for the spectacle of the creature, the annual gifts of his liberality which he poured upon men by means of the elements to provide for their needs, were to give them intelligence and fear of his divinity. But when the knowledge of God became weaker on the earth, and manners to be corrupted, God stoops to visit the human race; he gave the law, or he renewed it (for it was in nature, but almost forgotten) to restore the knowledge of his name and the authority of the law, and to inspire men with a salutary fear of this knowledge and the law more clearly promulgated. The men then had to be certain that the one who gave the law would judge their actions. Yet this law was powerless to divert them from sin,

wise reasons not to come to earth sooner. He first let mankind behave according to his will, but he did not remain without witness, for the spectacle of creation, the annual gifts of his liberality which he spread over men by the means elements to provide for their needs, were to give them intelligence and the fear of his divinity. Besides, the tradition which came from the first man and which had been transmitted to Enoch and Noah, preserved the knowledge of the true God on earth. But when, as a result of the weakness of the human race, the knowledge of the true God became weaker among men, and their manners to deprave themselves, the Lord deigned to choose Abraham to give him the example of renewed knowledge of God on earth and purity of manners. The men having become less respectful still for God, he gave them the written law by Moses, so that it could not be eroded from their memory, and inspired them with a salutary fear, because the fear is all the greater because the authority is more manifest. Now, as the nations scorned this law, refusing to submit to it, and those who received it did not observe it, the Lord, touched with compassion, sent his Son to immolate himself for them, destroying the empire of death, and giving to all men the remission of their sins, to offer them thus justified to God his Father. Indeed, he could only descend into hell by his death. Neither order nor reason allowed

which they could, however, avoid; the prophets multiplied their warnings for a long time until the loving God, sent his Son who, by immolating themselves for them and destroying the empire of death, gave them the remission of their sins in order to be able to justify them thus justified to God his Father. He wanted to make them aware of the danger he had torn from them, so that they would not stop giving thanks to God and that they would know that even if he would ask them to shed their blood for him, they would still be very far from what he did for them. How great is it, how precious is the benefit that death itself cannot recognize! But perhaps this objection will be made to me: If a great number, before the law, as after the law, overwhelmed by the weight of their sins, have plunged into the flesh, there are certainly some who are full of religion for the Creator, put a brake on their vicious inclinations. And after coming out of this life, did not they go down to hell? Now, if Christ had come sooner, immediately after the death of Adam, the deliverance of Adam, the victim of his own sin, would have opened to other men the way to heaven by giving them hope that after a lifetime pure and devoted to their Creator and Redeemer, they would be received in heaven. The late coming of Christ was therefore a real injury. Yes, the harm is obvious, but consider whether it is fair or unfair. There are prejudices that are of all justice. Is a

anyone to cross the threshold of iron without passing through death. If anyone wants to surprise the barbarians in their own country, does he not disguise himself under their clothing, so that they take him for one of them and so he can more surely find the means to destroy them? This is what God did for the devil; he had lost man by his guilty insinuations; God, in order to save him from death, found a remedy to take from the devil the victims whom he retained unjustly, to secretly enter his empire, and to make him feel like God in the underworld, the one in whom he thought he was to have killed man. From then on his wickedness was revealed, he lost all those whom he held captive, and the way to heaven was from then on open to all men. Such were the fruits of the coming of the Savior; he made known to men that their danger was liberated, and thus gave them a subject of continual thanksgiving. But perhaps this objection will be made to me: If many before the law and after the law, burdened by the burden of their sins, have plunged into the flesh and deserve to remain forever in hell, it is certainly, who, full of religion and respect for the Creator, have given to their life the natural law; however, were they not so restrained in limbo after this life? Now, if Christ had come immediately at the death of Adam, the deliverance of Adam who had made himself the first guilty, would have opened to other men the way to

thief caught in a flagrant crime, and sentenced to a quadruple, with no real injury? But this damage is just, and for a similar reason, the harm that the human race has suffered is of all justice, and that is why God has allowed it. The Savior, therefore, did not come from the beginning of the world. The demon having allowed himself to be dominated by pride, God created man to oppose him to the devil, so that, assisted by God, who fortified his natural impotence, he could resist him by remaining faithful to the precept he had received, by showing that he was on the earth the image of one God and proving, to destroy the opposite error, that only one God had created a single man from where all the others had to come down. But the devil had recourse to his ordinary ploys, he feigned to ignore the commandment which God had given to man, and he found the will of Eve tottering. It was then that he promised them that they would become like gods if they ate forbidden fruit, and that he succeeded in seducing them. Thus the devil won over man and the triumph he desired, and the man, shamefully vanquished, sold all his posterity to sin. It was not right, therefore, to remove the remains of the dead from the victor at once, for God can only act in a supremely just manner. Besides, the man had committed a most serious error by being persuaded that he would become like a god, and he fell into idolatry, another enormous crime

heaven, and those who would have lived well in the knowledge of the Creator would have been received in heaven after their death. The late coming of Christ has been a real prejudice here? Yes, the damage is obvious; but examine whether it is right or unjust. there are prejudices which are of all justice, and of which it is not permitted to complain. Is a thief caught in a flagrant crime, and sentenced to a quadruple, dare to complain? Now, the harm done to the human race was only right, that's why God allowed it. The Savior therefore did not come from the beginning of the world. The devil having allowed himself to be dominated by pride, God created man to oppose him to the devil, so that, with the help of God, who was able to absorb his natural impotence, he could resist him by remaining faithful to the command which it was given to him. Now the devil resorted to his ordinary ploys; he feigned to ignore the commandment that God had given to man, and he found Eve's will faltering. He then promised them for their disobedience that they would be like gods, and he managed to seduce them. The demon won over the man and the triumph he desired, and the man shamefully conquered, subjected all his posterity to sin. It was not right, therefore, to violently remove the remains of the victor, for God can only act in a supremely just manner. Moreover, the man had committed a most serious fault by being persuaded

against God. It was not right, therefore, that God came to his aid immediately, since he showed no repentance. The devil then subjected the righteous Job, Joseph, Jeremiah, Zechariah, the other prophets, and all the other righteous to innumerable sufferings. Christ then received from God his Father the mission to triumph over him, to manifest himself to the world, to destroy the empire of the devil by reason rather than by power, although everything is possible to God, but he always acts in a manner consistent with reason, and his behavior is always free from reproach.

that disobedience to the divine precept would make him a god, and he fell by the same into idolatry, another crime against God. It was not right, therefore, that God should come to his help immediately, since he showed no repentance, and the mercy of God would have been of little value to him if he had not known the punishment he deserved. In fact, although everything is possible with the power of God, he always acts in a manner consistent with reason, and his conduct is always safe from reproach.

1 <sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT	2 <sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT
<p><b>QUESTION 87.</b> IF THERE IS ONLY ONE GOD, WHY PUT IN THREE THE HOPE OF SALVATION, RATHER THAN IN TWO, IN FOUR OR IN ONE; WHY IN THE END HAS THE MYSTERY OF THE TRINITY NOT BEEN PREACHED FROM THE BEGINNING? — There has been almost nothing new here. One preaches the mystery of the Trinity but establishing faith in the existence of one God. No addition has been made, but the mystery of one God has been more fully revealed. This revelation was not to be done first, the preaching had to precede, and be followed by the revelation of the preached doctrine, revelation which was to teach us that the Father is the principle of all things, that the Son is the one by whom they exist, and the Holy Spirit, by whom all things of</p>	<p><b>QUESTION 9.</b> IF THERE IS ONE GOD, WHY MAKE THE HOPE OF SALVATION DEPENDENT ON THREE, NOT ON TWO OR FOUR, OR RATHER ONE? AND WHY WAS IT NOT PREACHED RATHER THE MYSTERY OF THE TRINITY? — There is only one God, but he is not alone. He has been from eternity in his mysterious being two other persons. Now, although God the Father had these two other persons in him, as I have said, it was proper to preach first only one God without making known the mystery contained in the divine nature; to say that the Father is the principle of the Son, and the Son the principle of the Son, because he has received from him what he is, and that the Father has sent the Son, the Son: sent the Holy Spirit. But when God, the principle of all things, was known,</p>

which the Father is the principle and which exist by the Son, take a new birth in faith to one God. So there are three people here, but only one deity. Now, it is by the effect of a sovereign reason that they are three, and not in more or less numbers. Every number rises to nine, because three times three is nine. Indeed, three are in one, and these three are one. He who sees this unity, sees the other three, because they do not differ from each other. Thus three are one, and three are multiplied by three. The number nine is perfect, because everything comes from unity. Add this unit to the number nine product of the number three multiplied by itself, and you have ten or twenty. Still, however, we go up to nine and add one to that number because nine are one, and that is how unity is given to perfection.

then he revealed to those who knew him his Son, whom he engendered in himself from all eternity. The Son of God thus manifested, in turn taught that it was the Father who was announced under the name of one God. He also revealed the existence of the Holy Spirit, which is the third after the Father, and the second after Christ, in numerical order, and not as to the substance, for the three persons do not differ at all, one from the other; and he taught that these three persons existed from all eternity in the mystery of God which we are to worship in the Trinity. For he wants us to pay the same homage to him as to himself who is its principle. Since all things are in God, that they were made by the Son, and that they received their light from the Holy Spirit, it was fitting that salvation be preached in the name of the Trinity, following the order of persons, and that the indivisible power of a single divinity receives our adorations. Now, it is by the effect of a sovereign reason that the divine persons are three in number, no more, no less. As these three people live in one another, the Trinity is preached on all sides, because three are in one and three are one. He who sees this unity sees the three persons because they do not differ from each other. So here three are one and one is three. This is the Trinity in all its perfection, and the perfect understanding of the Trinity is to know that these three persons are one.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 91. HOW CAN WE FIGHT PHOTIN'S ARGUMENTS, WHO CLAIMS THAT CHRIST IS NOT OLDER THAN MARY?** — Let us first question Jean-Baptiste, that the Savior himself proclaimed his witness publicly. Here, among others, is the testimony he gives to Our Lord: "He who comes from above is above all; he who came out of the earth is of the earth, and speaks of the earth. He who came from heaven testifies of what he has seen and heard, and no one receives his testimony." (Jn. 3:31) So, in comparison with the Lord, John calls all men, and himself, earthly, because he testifies that Jesus descended from heaven, and that all others are of the earth, that is to say have an inferior origin. Our Lord expresses the same truth when He says, "I did not come down from heaven to do my will, but the will of my Father, who sent me." (Jn. 6:38) Elsewhere he says in the same sense, " I do not say to you that I shall pray the Father for you; for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came from the Father." (Jn. 16:26-27) His disciples, hearing him speak so clearly, said to him, ""You speak openly and do not use parables. We now see that you know all things and there is no need for anyone to question you; for that we believe that you have gone out of God." (Jn. 16:29-30) These words need no explanation. In fact, the most important point of our religion is to believe that before his incarnation Jesus Christ was in heaven with God as the Son with the Father. If it is only because of his holy life and heavenly doctrine that he declares that he has come down from heaven, come out of God, and come into this world, all the prophets and apostles were able to keep the same language. Shall we say that these words, "Now I leave the world and go to my Father," (Jn. 16:28) mean that the doctrine that came out of God returns to God after leaving the world? This is the only explanation they can give. If, indeed, these words of the Savior, "That he is come down from heaven, that he is come out of God, and come into this world," must hear of the truth which was in him and of his doctrine, and not of his person, what he adds: "Now I leave the world and I go to my Father," must also be understood of this virtue, of this doctrine, which return to the place of their origin. But we see, on the contrary, that after the departure of the Savior, his virtue and his doctrine have persevered in the world. You see, then, that Our Lord will not speak here of his virtue and doctrine, but of himself. If you maintain that these are the words of virtue that worked in Christ, note that this virtue calls God his Father.

So you come up against the pitfall that you dread, because if the Son of God is the virtue of God, it is this same virtue of God which the Apostle said, "Christ is the virtue of God and the wisdom of God. (1 Cor. 1:24) This virtue of God is from God, and it returns to God. It is this same virtue, which is none other than Jesus Christ, who declares that he drives out demons by the Spirit of God (Matt. 12:28); the same Spirit who worked wonders by the apostles, to teach you that the Holy Spirit, through whom our Lord worked these miracles, did likewise by the apostles after the Lord departed from the earth, and give unanswerable proof that he wanted to speak about himself when he left the world to return to God. If you persist in thinking that this virtue is not Christ, then there will be two virtues and two sons of God; and what will become of the truth of these words, "The only begotten Son of God, who is in the bosom of the Father?" (Jn. 1:18) and of these others: "That is how God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son" (Jn. 3:16) You notice that this virtue of God who has worked in the world of external wonders is the same which is called at once the virtue of God and the Son of God. Now, let us see what the apostles believed and to whom they believed when they heard the Lord say to them, "Now I leave the world and go to my Father." (Jn. 16:28) They answered him, "Behold, you speak openly and do not use parables; for that we believe that you have gone out of God." Let us see now if the disciples have ever doubted that the miracles of the Lord had God as their author, when, for example, they saw the resurrection of Lazarus, who had been dead for four days, and exhaling the corruption of the tomb. (Jn. 11:44); a blind man from birth recovering sight (Jn. 9:1); a woman healed from a flow of blood by touching the edge of his garment (Matt. 9:20); the water changed into wine. (Jn. 2:9) None of them had the slightest doubt about either the Lord's person or his miracles, while others said he was Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. (Matt. 16:14) When the Jews wanted to stone him, what does Jesus answer them? "I have shown you many excellent works that come from my Father; why do you stone me?" (John 1:32) The Jews said to him, "We do not stone you for a good work, but for your blasphemy, and because being a man you make yourself God." What! the Jews have no doubt that the miracles of Jesus were the works of God, and the apostles would have doubted them? All doubt was therefore focused on the person of the Savior (for it was an unheard-of thing that could not fall into the human spirit and astonished men in the highest degree as to hear Jesus say that he was coming from of God and that he

had God for his Father); and the apostles declare themselves satisfied on this point with the clear language of the Lord: "We now see that you know all things, and there is no need for anyone to question you; for that we believe that you have gone out from God." If he did not really come out from God, the faith of the apostles is destroyed, but that is impossible because they had received the approval of the Savior. He said to them, "And now you believe," that is to say, so many wonders of which you have been witnesses could not have determined you to believe. It was thus demonstrated to the apostles that Christ came out of God and came into the world, and by the same they have no difficulty in believing that he was the Son of God. If no one sees God except Him who is of God (Jn. 6:46), and no one is born to the Father but the Son (Matt. 11:27), it is truly being in God the Father and being come out from God to come into this world. For no man could come out from God except him who was in God from the beginning (Jn. 1:1), because no one else knew God; There is nothing extraordinary for us to believe that the Savior is the true Son of God. This is what St. John says in his first letter, "That we may be in His true Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal wisdom. "(1 Jn. 5:20) And the Apostle in his Epistle to the Romans, "He spared not his own Son." (Rom. 8:32) And the Evangelist: "Because he said that God was his Father." (Jn. 5:18) Now, if Jesus Christ is the true Son of God, how could he be but a man? Would God call him true Son of God if God had truly begotten him? Let Photin tell us why he is believed to be the true Son of good if he is not truly true? Or what need to believe he is the Son of God, if he were but one of the saints who have been judged worthy to be called the sons of God? Is there not therefore some impropriety which forbids him to believe that he is the Son of God, like the others, and who motivates this superior title of Son of God, that it is so difficult to recognize him in all his truth? For, suppose that he is only above the others, what need to say: Believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, since after all he is like one of the others, if not because we are commanded to believe that he is the Son of God in a sense to what is different from others? That is, while many are called sons of God because of their holiness, only he is presented to our faith as the true Son of God, and that is why he is called the only begotten Son. Who, indeed, among the saints has ventured to affirm the Son of God, I do not say the only-begotten Son, except the Savior in his knowledge of his divine birth? How could he have suffered to be adored if he had known that he was of God, when it is written, "You will worship the Lord your

God and serve only Him alone?" (Deut. 6:13) Did not the angel take up St. John the Evangelist who wanted to worship him? "Take care to do it," said he, "I am a servant like you, adore God." (Rev. 19:10, 22:9) Now, although Scripture declares that God is to be served only (Deut. 6:13), did not the Apostle say, "Whoever serves Jesus Christ pleases God?" (Rom. 14:18) Why? Because God is the Christ, the Father and the Son are one. The same Apostle declares himself the servant of Jesus Christ, and he says to the Corinthians, "Do not become slaves of men," (1 Cor. 7:23) and the Galatians: "Paul established apostle not by men neither by the authority of any man, but by the authority of Jesus Christ his Father who raised him from the dead." (Gal. 1:1) He thus proves in clear terms that Jesus Christ is at once God and man and that his title of an apostle does not come from a man, but from Jesus Christ, as he is God and that he comes from God the Father. And he adds below: "I have received neither the gospel of any man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." (Gal. 1:12) What is clearer St. Paul declares that it is not of a man whom he received the doctrine of God, but was instructed in the school of God itself. For us it is by men that we have received the doctrine of God, but this vessel of election declares that he has learned nothing from the apostles, that is to say by means of men. Shall we say that he learned nothing from men because it is a question of the doctrine of God? or would it be the exceptional privilege he claims if he had learned it like the other apostles? Why does he say, "I have received neither the gospel of any man, but the revelation of Jesus Christ?" Who can question that St. Paul did not want to teach here the divinity of Jesus Christ? And what would be astonishing, since in his Epistle to the Romans he said to them in speaking of the Jews, "to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed forever. (Rom. 9:5) What do these words mean, "From whom did Jesus come out according to the flesh?" The Apostle did not speak in this way if Jesus Christ also existed according to God, it is to say that according to the flesh Jesus Christ came out of the patriarchs, and that according to the divinity he came out of God, and he is the God above all things. Would one try to apply these words to the person of the Father? But there is no question here of the Father. If, then, we refuse to apply them to Jesus Christ, to what other person will they agree? Why not, then, apply them to Jesus Christ, in whose name every knee bends in heaven, on earth, and in hell (Philip 2:10), that is to say, who is God above all things, for there is nothing left apart from those just

enumerated? Let Photin tell us if these creatures are bending their knees before a man, or if God has ordained these celestial powers and holy angels to worship a man, no doubt, because God cannot order anything that is contrary to reason. If, then, it is forbidden on earth to worship another than God, how much more in heaven? A king, on earth, receives the homage of his subjects as taking the place of God. Now Jesus Christ, after fulfilling his mission of God, now receives the adoration of heaven and earth. We read that the Word became flesh, that is to say that the Word became incarnate in the bosom of Mary by the operation of the Holy Spirit, this Word who was in God from the beginning who is God and is called the Son of God. How then, who was from the beginning and who was God, would not have been older than Mary? Even if your blindness goes so far as to deny that he is God, you cannot deny that he is the Word; and you are not ignorant: not that this Word is called the Son of God, and that He was in God from the beginning. By what reason do you sustain that he is older than Mary, since you read that he existed from the beginning? St. John speaking of Jesus Christ in the Apocalypse says, "And his name is the Word of God." (Rev. 19:13) The name Word has several meanings. All that comes out of the nature of God must be called God; but to safeguard the authority of one God, the Evangelist gives the name of the Word to him who is born of God, so that as we are persuaded that our words can only come out of us, we also believe that Christ came out of God. We cannot hear in another sense that Christ comes from God and not from a principle apart from God. It is in the same sense that he is called the virtue and wisdom of God that come from God in the same way. If the Evangelist had said God and God, he would not have expressed that he had gone out of God, but he would have done as two gods, which is opposed to the divine unity. The holy books teach, it is true, that Jesus Christ is God, but without ever going beyond the unity of one God. How then, Photin, do you drive madness until you want to establish in the first chapter of Saint John a punctuation different not to recognize that the Word is God? Indeed, here as you read: " In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God." (Jn. 1:1-2) What does this division mean? What meaning does it present? What Christian meaning? It indicates only open hostility against the Son of God; for what does this phrase, punctuated in this way, signify again: "And the Word was with God, and was God?" So then all the wisdom of our law would be to teach us that God exists. What language, which

nation, which earth, which sect dares to deny the existence of God? What does the Evangelist mean by saying, "And the Word was with God," (Jn. 1:1), and what does he mean to us to understand by this Word, if not the eternal reason of God? For it is not for God, whom no one doubts, that the Gospel is written, but for the Word, whose nature is called into question. It is indeed the mystery of God, a mystery that must be believed, because it does not have for all minds the evidence of a proven truth. The gospel therefore applies to teach us what the Word is by saying, "And the Word was with God, and the Word was God, He was from the beginning with God." This meaning is in accordance with the reason, and the integrity of the proposal is preserved. St. John therefore wants to teach us that this Word who was with God from the beginning and who was God in this mystery of the eternal God unknown to the ages and generations that preceded, we must believe that he was God and that he was with God. And as there is doubt between the carnal minds, who would not want Scripture to go beyond the feebleness of their understanding in their language, God has established faith which conforms to the meaning of inspired Scripture and receives the reward of his docility. When Solomon asked God for wisdom, the Lord answered him, "I have given you a wise and intelligent heart, so that there is never in a man before you like you, will not rise after you." (1 Kgs. 3:12) What shall we say? Is the promise of God true? Assuredly, and nothing is more true. No man will be like Solomon. What shall we say about Jesus Christ, whose words are as follows: "The queen of the south has come from the ends of the earth to listen to the wisdom of Solomon, and there is greater here than Solomon?" (Matt. 12:42) Choose now, Photin; who will you believe? Will it be to God or to Jesus Christ, to the Father or to the Son? If you believe in the Father, you condemn the Son; if you believe in the Son, you accuse the Father. If, in fact, Jesus Christ is but a man, he is wrong in going to Solomon against the promise of God. If, on the contrary, he is truly God, he was right in setting himself above Solomon, and the promise of God remains inviolable, because in fact no one like Solomon has been brought up. Jesus Christ declares himself superior to Solomon only because he is God. The extravagance of Photin, who does not want to acknowledge that Christ existed before Mary, although he hears it attesting that he existed before Abraham! Indeed, when the Jews were discussing with him about his age, saying to him, "You are not yet fifty years old and you have seen Abraham," (Jn. 8: 55) what did he say to them? "Truly, I say to

you, before Abraham was, I am." He does not say I am superior to him, he answers. the question that was put to him, that is to say, that he existed long before the Jews thought. Photin cannot escape the curse pronounced by the law, because he places his hope in Jesus Christ, in whom he sees only one man; for it is written, "Cursed be the man who places his hope in man." (Jer. 17:5) But for the Apostle, who knew that Jesus Christ was God, it is not only for the present life, but for the future life that he places his hope in him. "If the hope that we have in Jesus Christ," he says, "is only for this life, we are the most unhappy of all men." (1 Cor. 15:19) So it is not only in a man that we are taught to place our hope, for it would be a vain hope. We chose these reasons among several others; if Photin were good, what we said last would be enough.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 101. ON THE BOASTFULNESS OF ROMAN DEACONS.<sup>1</sup>** — We only want to obey the orders of charity, and yet we may be blamed by writing on a subject that has never been a subject of doubt for anyone. But in wishing to avoid wounding the rights of friendship, we hinder the zeal which ought to have made use of a hitherto hidden evil. Charity, as we have said, makes it our duty to respond to extravagant assertions, lest a prolonged silence only worsens the evil, and after much unnecessary agitation, any amendment became impossible. The special character of charity is not to seek one's interests. A certain man who had the name of a false god<sup>2</sup>, driven by the folly and pride of the city of Rome, endeavored to equal the Levites to priests, and the deacons to the presbyters. I will not say that he has sought to place them above the elders, the pretension would be far too absurd and seem incredible, and we would pass ourselves for men who want not to reform an abuse, but to slander. On what law, on what custom, on what example do they base this claim to equal those who have no mark of distinction in the Church to the leaders of God who, in the house of God and in the sacrament of Christ, occupy the first rank? Nobody could say it. What audacity to want to equal to presbyters those who are only their ministers! What a reckless presumption to compare with the elders those who bear the tabernacle with all its vessels, those who are charged with cutting the wood and carrying the water of the sacrilege, for

such was the office of the Levites. It is as if one wished to equal the attendants to the prefects, the servants to their masters. For this is what the Lord said to Moses: "Take the Levites among the children of Israel, and present them to the great priest Aaron, that they may serve him." (Num. 8:13) What is more clear than this example, which the Church continues to observe today? In spite of the great impudence of the deacons of the Roman Church, they have not yet made their pretensions to the places of honor of the Church. If they are not charged with all the least offices of the hierarchy, it is thanks to the multitude of lower clerics. Otherwise it is up to them to carry the altar and the sacred vessels, to pour water on the hands of the priest, as is done in all the churches and according to the order that the Lord gave to Moses: "Would they be better than Elijah, who poured water on the hands of Elijah?" (2 Kgs. 3:11) This certain man who had the name of a false god pleads the cause of the deacons against the presbyters as if one were raised from the presbyters to the diaconate and, not from the diaconate to the presbyters, but they are, he says, ministers of the Roman Church and more worthy of honor therefore than in the other churches because of the splendor of the city of Rome, which like the queen of all other cities, if so, he must claim the same privilege for the priests of the Roman Church, for if the splendor of this city gives greater importance to the lower ministers, how much more to those who are clothed with the highest dignities? All that is granted to the ministers of a power to the growth of power itself, just as the honors rendered to the servant are to the praise of the master whom they serve. Let us say, however, that before God, the just judge, everyone remains in possession of the rank which is assigned to the various ecclesiastical offices; that is to say, he who is a deacon receives in all the churches the honor which is due to the deacon. And it is not a mediocre honor to be the servant of the priest of God in the Church alone; to the priest, he sums up in him all the ecclesiastical honors. In fact, the higher order eminently contains the lower order, because the one whom the Apostle calls presbyters fulfills the functions of deacon, exorcist and reader. Now, St. Paul demonstrates that by this presbyter must be understood the bishop, when after having raised Timothy to this dignity, he teaches him the qualities of those whom he himself will raise to the episcopate. (1 Tim. 3:1) For what is a bishop, if not the first presbyter, that is, the high priest? He does not call them otherwise than his colleagues in the priesthood and the priesthood. Does the bishop call ministers, deacons his colleagues in the diaconate?

No, no doubt, because they are far inferior in dignity. It is not proper to say of a judge that he is the first of the lower officers. We will also point out that in the Church of Alexandria and throughout Egypt, in the absence of the bishop, it is the presbyter who consecrates. Now the example of Caiaphas, who, despite the excess of his wickedness, did not fail to prophesy, shows us all the grandeur of priestly dignity. Why did he prophesy? "Because he was prince of priests. (Jn. 11:49) We still see the great distance that separates the deacon from the priest in the book of Acts of the Apostles. Many of the inhabitants of Samaria having embraced the faith at the preaching of the deacon Philip, whom the Apostles had ordained, they sent to Peter and John, says the author of the book of Acts, to beg them to come, and to give to the faithful the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands. (Acts 8) But those who support these claims do not know the Scriptures and have forgotten the law. He who formulates such assertions, however, should remember what happened to the Levites who harbored similar sentiments. They also had the temerity to assert that the Levites were equal to the priests, and the righteousness of God opened the earth to swallow Korah and his followers (Num. 16:31), and a torrent of fire at the same time devour two hundred and fifty men. King Uzziah, who had dared to usurp a priestly office, was struck with a leprosy that covered him completely so that this example inspired all the others with the salutary fear of usurping a power which was not granted to them. (2 Chron. 26:21) Now, on the contrary, we see deacons rash enough to perform the priestly functions in the meals and want to be answered in prayer, a privilege reserved for the priests alone. The office of the deacon is to receive from the hand of the priests what he must give to the people. You see all that can produce a vain presumption. The pride with which they are full makes them forget everything, and because they see themselves as ministers of the Roman Church, they do not consider the duties that God has imposed on them and the obligation to be faithful to them. What erodes these considerations from their memory are the cares, the attentions with which their inferiors surround them, and which have a great influence either by the good ones, or by the bad counsels which are following it: or we fear their bad suggestions, or we buy them so that they are favorable. These are the ones that prevent deacons from properly considering the nature of their order. These considerations inspired by flirtation, these illegitimate respects become for them a pitfall and give them an exaggerated idea of their power; for, seeing that the priests are much less witnessed, they

imagine that they are far above them. But, it is said to me, it is the testimony of the deacon who designates the one who must be ordained a presbyter, as if this right of suffrage indicated a prerogative of power. We read in the Acts of the Apostles these words of St. Peter to the people: "Choose among us those whom we shall establish for the service of the mysteries of the Church," (Acts 6:3) I don't mean for table service. Here are deacons created by the sufficiency of the laity. And the Apostle wants him who is to be elevated to the episcopate to have the suffrage of the Gentiles themselves: "It is necessary, he says, that those abroad also give him a good testimony." (1 Tim. 3:7) All have the right to vote, but not all of them are worthy of honor. All can judge of the qualities which it demands, but all cannot claim to the dignity of which they judge the others capable. A good painter may be appreciated and preferred to another by a man who does not know how to paint himself, just as a flute player may be put on top of another by a man of another profession; thus a man of inferior condition can bear witness to him who is to be raised to the priesthood. Here is another circumstance that makes them believe that everything is due to them. It is us, they say, who lead those who are to be ordained, that is to say, because they serve as their procession, they think themselves worthy of the same honor. Let's admit the fact; the bishops send them as servants to do honor to those who are to be ordained. It is thus that the emperor, to appear in all his dignity, is surrounded by a military procession, without for that the army which surrounds him is superior, nor even equal. Thus Aman, who was one of the first officers of Ahasuerus, was commissioned by this king to honor Mordecai to show everyone by this deferential act how worthy Mordechai was. Thus deacons are chosen to do honor to those who are to be raised to the presbyters, so that all may understand that they are worthy; for with the exception of priests, to whom deacons owe obedience, deacons have pre-eminence over all others.

(1) I am not sure whether the common preference of '*levita*' over '*diaconus*' might not be adduced as an instance: but my immediate purpose is to call attention to the joint occurrence in both (Ambroisaster and Damascus) of a word that never became as popular in Christian usage as '*levita*' but seems to have been fashionable in Roman church circles of that particular generation. (*Journal of Theological Studies*, Volume 7; CH Turner; Clarendon Press, 1906; p. 182)

(2) Question 101 contains the name of a Roman deacon, veiled by the phrase *quidam igitur qui nomen habet falsi dei*. In all the editions the sentence reads *quidam igitur qui nomen habet Falcidi*. It is strange how such a sentence could have passed muster for over four centuries. In the eyes of some people anything is good enough to be Christian Latin. Yet the writer shows clearly by the use of the word *quidam* that he could give the name of the Roman deacon if he chose, and from friendship does not so choose. For the correct reading, now recovered from the manuscripts, is *falsi dei*, and *Falcidi* must disappear from the biographical dictionaries. Who is then to take his place? I think it probable that the deacon meant is Concordius, who is known to have lived at that time; then the divinity alluded to will be Concordia. This Concordius, according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, was a deacon of Rome and one of the prosecutors of Damasus on a capital charge. He was expelled from the Church by a synod of bishops about the end of 378, or the beginning of 379. (Alexander Souter; *A Study of Ambrosiaster*; The University Press, 1905; p. 181)

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 113. WHY WAS THE SON OF GOD SENT, AND NOT ANOTHER?**— All the actions of God are imposed upon the faith with a character of reason and unquestionable wisdom; however, it is better, I think, to add to faith the knowledge of the fact, to avoid the reproach of ignorance. Our Lord Himself confirms this truth when he says, "Eternal life is to know you, the only true God, and the one you sent, Jesus Christ." (Jn. 17:3) We must first believe according to the prophet's recommendation (Isa. 7:9 according to the Septuagint), then seek to know what is the object of faith, and the Holy Spirit comes here to help the faithful and attentive soul to discover the reason of his faith. Indeed, the joy that gives him faith is full when he can understand what he believes. This knowledge is the strength of his faith, and the unshakable foundation of his claim. When faith is alone, piety is not so full, and suspicion can find access in the soul. Thus the vessel of election endeavors to persuade the faithful to penetrate the motives of their faith. For when they have known the greatness and power of him to whom they have believed, no strength, no reason, can detach them from the hope they have put in him. This is why the Psalmist tells us: "Taste and see that the Lord is full of sweetness." (Ps. 33:9) He wants the faithful to know the flavor of his divinity,

understanding that there is nothing wiser than to believe in Jesus Christ. It is for the same reason that the doctor of nations says to the Colossians: "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." (Col. 2:3) And elsewhere: "I know who I entrusted my deposit with, and I am sure he is powerful enough to keep it to this day." (2 Tim. 1:12) Here is a Christian who knows the reason of his faith, who does not doubt the power of God, who understands that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are enclosed in the mystery of birth, passion and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Now, without any prejudice to the faith, I meditated for a long time in order to see why Our Lord descended from the heavenly dwelling to incarnate on earth, and not another of those, for example, that the Savior himself even calls the holy angels. This paralyzing unbecoming for his divine person, unless one discovers the reason. Here, indeed, is what impresses a large number of minds. The Providence of God the Father could, it seems, choose another person to accomplish this work, to destroy the empire of the great devil, envious of our salvation, and of his followers, and to take away all his spoils as the fruit of his victory. It seems that God must suppress the obstinacy and insolence of these rebellious servants, by the ministers of his will, and not undertake, he the Lord of all things, a work which appears unworthy of him. Indeed, Satan has not a force, a power so great that a power of the same nature cannot triumph, since with the help of God the men themselves win over him the victory. Although there is no complete equivalence in the examples borrowed from human things, yet they have some relation to the matter we are dealing with. A subject revolts against king David, he sends Joab also his subject to pursue him and put him to death. (2 Sam. 20:6) His subjects are still charged with fighting the rebellion of Absalom against his father (*Ibid.* 15:4); still more, the power of a single chosen from a thousand would have sufficed to triumph over the tyrannical domination of the devil. Do not we read that in the fight he gave to the Archangel Michael, he could not pre-empt, but was hurled on the earth! (Rev. 12:7) Now, meditating seriously on this subject, I could only discover that the Son of God had been sent by his Father, because it might have seemed offensive to his dignity to entrust to another the recompense of the work of his hands; however this reason was not enough. It did not explain to me clearly the cause of this great and admirable mystery, I needed other reasons to give me intelligence. And so I came to convince myself that the work of recompense itself required the coming of him who came down to earth. There was a special reason

for him to come to fight the one who had usurped his dignity and his titles. Indeed, the devil wanted to be recognized as God after God the Father, what he still tries to do today, although this title does not belong to him in any way, but to the Son of God who is the second after God the Father, not by nature, but by the rank we give him. Now, to support here the great cause of truth, no one else must have incarnated as our Lord Jesus Christ, who came not only to repress the efforts of the devil, but to reveal himself to all men, so that, rejecting all society with the devil, they recognize him for him whose Satan had usurped power and majesty. He also wanted the knowledge of the truth to make them give up the error, some as they were that Jesus Christ is the Son of God who alone is God of God, the head or principle of all that exists in the world, being heaven or on the earth, for the strength and power which he displayed in the triumph he won over the tyranny of Satan, made him known to him whose devil full of ungodliness, that is to say, Satan had usurped the empire. In the unjust purpose he had conceived of calling himself God to give over the spiritual powers (which earned him this reproach from the prophet: "You said in your heart, I will place my throne in the clouds, and I be like unto the Most High" (Isa. 14:14), he has brought many into rebellion, and it is through their united efforts that he has become the prince of error. It is to these spirits that the Psalmist addresses himself to urge them to reject the lie and to receive the truth, when he says to them, "Princes, raise up your doors, and you, eternal doors, lift up, and the King of glory will enter. Indeed, the error of the unbelieving mind must first be removed so that they may receive the faith of one God in Jesus Christ. He therefore recommends them to lift the doors by which one goes to death, following the unbelief whose demon is the principle, and to receive the mysteries of faith which lead to life. For these are the eternal doors: the truth of faith is eternity, unbelief, on the contrary, is a temporal and transient thing, because the lie is an invention of the devil. It is he, indeed, who sowed on the earth the seeds of the evasiveness that he had committed in heaven by advising men the worship of several gods, on which he kept primacy. He wanted to be the leader and the prince of all the others, which did not belong to him, but was due only to the Savior. The Son of God therefore pursues him to the earth, to reveal by victory that he wins over him his criminal error, in the light of the truth which shines in all his person. This is what made the Psalmist say: "The truth has come out of the bosom of the earth." (Ps. 84:12) The devil chased from heaven sought a refuge on earth, to

exercise among men the divine power which he had conceived the plan to assume in heaven. What made the Apostle say: "He will go so far as to sit in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God." (2 Thess. 2:4) All means are good for him to fulfill his desires and to incur damnation, for in the fury with which he is full, he regards it as a lesser evil to be damned than not to satisfy his ardent passion for establishing his error.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 115. CONCERNING DESTINY.** — Nothing is more contrary to the Christian faith than to deal with judicial astrology, which is the enemy of the law of God. If men are born good or bad, the law is useless; I will say more, the legislator is guilty of injustice. He who, by his law, forces men to do what is contrary to the nature they received at birth, knowing that they cannot change this nature, seems to have given them the law only to have an opportunity to satisfy his cruelty with the loss of man; for why defend what he knows cannot be avoided? Or how can he damn a man who did not do what he could not do? If there is here, as we cannot deny, manifest injustice, as it would be a crime to attribute it to God, we must recognize that it is with reason and wisdom that he has given the law to the man, because he knew he could avoid what the law forbade him. If he is right when he gives the law, he is also right when he avenges the transgression. If, then, we must believe that the law of God has been given in all justice, we must carefully escape and avoid judicial astrology, for it is one of the inventions of the cunning and deceit of the devil. He dares not enter into an open struggle with his Creator, he resorts to a thousand ploys to outrage God, to make man the enemy of the law, and to precipitate him thus in the second death. He who therefore submits to the authority of God and considers it a crime to discuss his actions, obeys the law he has given, applies day and night to meditate upon his prescriptions, and takes no account of any difficulty in it is that man can observe what the law commands. Those, on the contrary, who desire to abandon themselves to vice, seek the means of escape from the responsibility of their conduct, and to reject their sins on the weakness of their nature to avoid the punishment which is reserved for the sinner. This is what those who, having lost the hope of the future life promised to them

do, seek only to enjoy the pleasures of the present life. But for those who rely on the confidence of faith and hope for the good of eternal life, they strive to do what they promised in the day of their regeneration, by renouncing their desires and pleasures of Satan. This evil spirit has therefore unfolded all his ploys to make man more inclined to sin and thereby satisfy his dark envy. In fact, the man who hears that he is born to sin, and knowing that God is all righteousness, thinks he can sin with liberty, because a judge who makes a profession of justice cannot condemn anyone who does not have sinned inevitably by its nature. We cannot even say that it is he who sins, it is another who uses it to sin. This is how man has been deceived; he is overwhelmed by the weight of a multitude of sins, and death becomes his punishment. So to take away from man the responsibility for evil is to take away the merit of good. If the sinner does not deserve to be punished, the just has no right to the crown. Why then praise the good and blame the wicked? If it is by virtue of his nature that man cannot sin, why praise in him that which does not come from him? Why, on the other hand, condemn in him who sins a fault of which he is not the author? Can one unjustly praise the virtuous man and accuse the wicked? It may be said to me: what I praise in man is good nature: what I condemn is the bad; Thus, one speaks with praise of good wine, although it is necessarily good by nature, and one rejects the bad, which also derives from its nature this bad quality. If it were so, there is nothing left to take back, the righteous man has no right to any praise, no reward, and the sinner escapes all accusation and punishment. Now, however, we know and read that the righteous are rewarded in this life and in the future life, and that sinners suffer the rigorous punishment of fire. Now, would it not be an injustice that one who has only followed the necessary inspirations of his nature be condemned to the torments of unforgiving fire, and another who has merely obeyed its nature share the eternal rewards? If the good is to be praised for having done what was in its nature, the wicked is equally entitled to praise, since he has also done only what his nature commanded him; both, therefore, deserve to be praised for remaining in the state where God has acted them. If man is worthy of blame for remaining in the state which is a necessary consequence of his nature, the blame goes back to his Creator, who brought him into a state where man could only displease him. If on the contrary it is with justice that the just is rewarded and the sinner condemned, it is no more to nature, but to the will addressed by reward or punishment. Nature is out of the

question, and we have to do only the will, which is subject to the various suggestions of the senses. Thus, when the sinner sees that the righteous is crowned while he is punished, he is to blame only himself who, by yielding to the inspirations of the senses against the law, has done evil when he could do good. Can we blame the sun because it burns, or the water because it is refreshing? Is water worthy of reward, because it quenches the consuming thirst of men, or the sun because it warms their icy limbs by the rigors of the cold? No, for they have done only what is in their nature; we do not think to blame or praise them, for they could do no more than what they did. Now, the very nature of human actions destroys the system of observers of the stars. It is impossible to meet a man who always does nothing but good or bad deeds. If his conduct were always irreproachable, it would give reason to believe that it is at his birth that he must always do good, and one would conclude that he is also obliged to be bad, if his actions were always bad. But seeing that this man, whom you believe to be born exclusively to do good, sometimes does evil, and that this other whom you say born for evil does not fail to do good sometimes, how to prove with truth that the wicked man is bad, and that the virtuous man is good, if not admitting as certain that man follows the path that his will chooses? There are causes that give birth to sins; thus envy is the mother of disputes and hostilities. Now, the things that the law forbids, men do not do them openly and in public, but in secret. Why? by some respect for the law. If, as they say, they were born to do evil, they would not seek to hide themselves, they would not be held back by this fear of the law, but they would do without doubt what nature compels them to do. But you see them reviewing carefully the means to sin in secret; they choose the places, the people, the times to execute the designs of their guilty will. The good ones do their good works only with discernment, according as the time or the interest of their fellows demands it. It is no longer nature who is here responsible for their actions, but the will that is in nature. If it was an exclusively natural thing, why this discernment! If we wanted to discuss this question thoroughly, it would be easy for us to show that those who are now righteous started out as sinners, and that they formed a plan to change their lives. We read that Abraham was justified by faith. (Jam. 2:3, Rom. 4:3) It was not so before, so it may be supposed that he was then like his father worshiping idols. It is the same with Zacchaeus, to whom the Lord testifies, after he led the lives of the people of his profession. (Luke 19:9) The vessel of election

confesses this same truth when it says, "We were formerly children of wrath like the rest of men" (Eph. 2:3) because the will was past as in nature. It is upon their will that men are judged, and not on their nature. There is no doubt that all martyrs and righteous people have become good, because it is not at their first birth, but at their spiritual regeneration that they must be faithful. And how many do we know whose life has been a long succession of disorders and infamies, and who are now professing continence and holiness? Their souls were opened to the fear of God, and they triumphed over the vices that tyrannized them. Here is a striking proof of what fear of the law can do here. Before Julian's edict, women could not separate from their husbands. As soon as this permission was given to them, they did what they could not do previously; they are seen every day to separate freely from their husbands. Where, then, was fatality hidden for all the time that preceded? She was probably hiding for fear of the law. How did the law come about that Moses gave? Probably while destinies slept. This law has imposed on the Jews a multitude of important precepts, and no other people has received similar ones. And that it is not believed that the observation of these precepts was limited to the country where they were given, for the Jews dispersed today while the whole universe continue to observe them. Now, these precepts destroy the doctrine of fatality. For three thousand years and more since the creation of the world, they did not exist, and after having been promulgated, they remain until the end. Now, what has been so many thousand years without existence, how did it begin? For the course of the stars it goes back to the origin of the world. And how is it that in this great multitude of Jews scattered throughout the universe, none of them is seen embracing paganism, while we rarely see, it is true, pagans becoming Jews? Thus, for the Jews, fate cannot be admitted; they have been freed from his laws, and they persevere in their empowerment. What shall we say about Sodom and Gomorrah, whose punishment remains inscribed in visible characters to all eyes? (Gen. 19:24) All their inhabitants covered with marks of their infamy were devoured by a fire descended from heaven. In the flood all men had the same fate, and all perished with the same death and at the same time, with the exception of the household of Noah. (Gen. 7:12) Will it also be said that the entire army of Pharaoh was born under the authority of the same decree, to give right to the senseless error of the astrologers, since in fact they were engulfed in the Red Sea with their king? How many other examples do we pass over in silence because these two are enough for

the purpose that we propose to ourselves? And what much stronger party could we draw from so many laws and religious institutions? Each nation has different ones. What is allowed in one is forbidden in another, and vice versa. Thus in this city of Rome, which is given the name of majestic and sacred, it is permissible for women to leave their husbands, although the divine law removes this faculty even from men, except in the case of women of adultery. The barbarians are in this superior to the Romans. And it was not impossible for them to observe the same rule, since in fact it was observed before. Destiny has therefore been changed, since it was allowed it was forbidden before. It is forbidden in the Roman empire to be a eunuch; other peoples allow it. It could also be done here, because it is done secretly; and without the fear that holds, it would be public. It is therefore fear that holds destiny, and it is like bound, if it does not do what it wants to do. The Persians wear earrings in the example of women, which is forbidden here as an indecency. Now, however, that we can conform here to this custom, that is what proves the priests of the mother who is called great; and indeed she was great, but a great courtesan; but there is here the difference which separates womanish from men. What shall we say then? They are the only ones in the whole universe who are born subject to this decree of destiny which forces them to transform themselves into women by a shameful operation, and into the whole world where only a few can find them. But we know that it is through the pressure of threats and promises that they are forced to submit to this operation, which is both painful and intense. But if they were condemned by their birth, they would not be forced to do so. Among the Persians it is still permissible for fathers to unite with their daughters, and the proof that this could be done absolutely here is that some give the example of such unions. But as the severity of the laws is opposed to it, fear restrains men and prevents them from doing what is absolutely possible, but that which is not permitted. What is the end of prohibitive laws? It's to prevent something that could be done. Now, if it were subject to fatality, it could not be done, and would not be the object of a defense. If, on the contrary, it is not subject to fate, and it is forbidden by a law, it is a proof that what does not depend on fatality can be done. Would it be wise indeed to defend what cannot be done, for example to fly from the city of Rome to Spain, or to carry a mountain on his shoulders? We can only defend actions that can, but should not be. It is the custom of the Moors that women wear gold rings on the nostrils; Is it destiny that makes them a law? If it were so

they would keep this custom when they come among us, because if it is a law of destiny, everyone is subject to the fate of his own. But the proof that destiny is here for nothing, is that scarcely arrived among us, all renounce this use they regarded as a mark of distinction, and they now find ridiculous. It must be admitted for certain that among all peoples, number is number, earth is earth, water is water, air is air, and fire is fire. Can we find somewhere a land that is not solid, an air that is tangible, a water that is not liquid and cold or a fire that has no heat? Thus, everywhere Jupiter is Jupiter, Saturn is Saturn, Venus is Venus. The same is true of other things. This science of judicial astrology is subjected everywhere to the same rules, while the institutions of the various nations are not subject to this uniform rule of destiny, which is everywhere the same, but depends on the studies and thoughts of the human mind. He whom his merit raised in the first rank among his fellow-citizens, imposed upon them as law what he believed most suited to reason and to the honor of his people. Thus each country, each nation has its own laws and institutions. Salon and Lycurgus have established a great number of laws which have been observed by the Greeks, and which little by little, as their kingdom became weaker, have fallen into disuse. The kings of Judea chose the mules as mounts; Roman kings and emperors preferred horses; the kings of Geramantes, African tribe above Tripoli, used bulls; the kings of Persia were driven on chariots, for the ancient kings of the Persians did not even allow their people to see them; the kings of Midian make camels their favorite mount, and surrounded their neck with chains of gold; in Africa, donkeys are preferred to horses. All these different uses exist; yet they are not all equally in favor of all peoples; each people chooses what they like more. Do we not manifest ourselves these different tastes in our clothes, in our food, in other uses of life, and in our opinions themselves? Now, what is opposed to the fact that these diverse tastes are attributed to destiny, as those who teach that destinies are said to be different according to men, are the frequent mutability of our will. What we have long loved ends up displeasing us, and we begin to love what we could not first tolerate, and the force of habit gives us a kind of inalterability. Will they attribute to destinies this alternative of inclinations which return with the periodic revolutions of time, and which reproduce after a certain number of years what is being done today, for men do not remain in the same state? But education and habit give them a denial. The use of wine was long unknown to Roman women. Habit, the result of

education, confirmed them in this abstaining, which they observed, because they appreciated its value. Was it the result of destiny, which, by ceasing to exist, put an end to a useful habit? But this use was the effect of education and not of destiny. As soon as they wished to break with this habit, the fruits of education were lost. The ancient Romans carried abstinence so far that they refused even the presents offered to them, judging the good reputation as a treasure, and preferring virtue to pleasures; these destinies have thus changed or they have ceased to exist. But no, it was not one of destiny, but of education which was the master of destiny itself. How to attribute to destiny that which was not submitted to it in the past, and what is not more so in the present? In truth, I do not know why they want to make destiny so horrible by presenting it as the author of all that is done, while all at once he is and he is not. Is it education that directs, it is not; is it the habit, it is not; Is it not chance, it is not more; and it seems to exist only to be chained by the fear of the law, because fear serves to repress passion, and the desire to please God causes the love of money to be rejected. We cannot deny here to a certain extent the existence of what is bound, and yet we can say with all reason that what is bound does not exist, because it is without authority. He who follows the law of God, and who contracts the habit of a holy life, sees all that is called destiny fade before him. The force of habit is so great that it relaxes the animals themselves. It is by wanting to live according to their bad desires that men make their destinies to themselves. Debauchery and pleasure produce self-indulgence and the disorder which in turn gives rise to the excesses of recklessness and anger. They know that their conduct is worthy of punishment, but in order to escape it, they attribute to fate the crimes which dishonor them, and in this they are shaken by the demons who do everything for the criminal designs to come out of their way; that is what these men call destinies, without understanding that they are the enemies of man. If sins did not enter into the soul through the senses, but took birth in its interior, it is with some reason that all the evil that it can do would be attributed to destinies; but how to attribute it to destinies when we see that it is sight, hearing and the other senses that give rise to the concupiscence of evil, with the help of enemies who suggest to men to do what is wrong for them? but we do not think about it so long as the guilty action lasts; it seems full of sweetness before or while one indulges in it; it is hardly consumed that it makes one feel bitterness. However, we can triumph over these guilty ambitions, and here is the proof. Is our mind strongly applied to

some thought, or to some design, our enemies are silenced, and the passion remains mute, for they can do nothing on a busy soul. You see a man delivered entirely to an occupation which absorbs him, will you suggest to him foreign thoughts? No, you do not do it, you know that you would not be listened to or dismissed as a nuisance. This is what happens to these enemies, who are none other than demons, and the gods of the pagans; if they see us engaged in the meditation of divine things, they do not suggest contrary thoughts to us, but they stand in ambush to spy on the favorable moment when they can find access in our souls. The meditation of the law of God and the active life are therefore the secure walls of the soul; if, on the contrary, the demons see us affect a sad idleness to the divine things, they take occasion to excite us to sin. It is they who by flesh and blood sow guilty desires in our souls. No doubt the flesh here has an action that has its origin, and the inclinations of the carnal birth are far from resting, however the demons come to lend them a hand to give more surely death to men. There are many kinds of demons and their desires are different. There are some who trouble the mind to annoy the body; others who mingle with the blood to engender guilty desires; others unite themselves closely to the heart of man, to suggest to him, by blinding him, thoughts which are fatal; some exert their power over the bodies they chained by the infirmities, like that daughter of Abraham whom the Lord heals. (Luke 13:11) The pagans in their ignorance attribute to destiny all these things that are due to various causes that evil spirits exploit by making use of every opportunity to excite man to sin and make him slave of his passions. They call it good destiny, when the bodies are well tempered, or they are distinguished by a certain instability, by a particular grace; they call it the bad destiny, when heat or mood dominate it, or if instead of this grace, this kindness, they are rather disposed to harm, it is those, they say, who are born under a bad star. Suppose these assumptions are true. We see these same differences in animals, some of whom have more warmth than others; but animals are not endowed with reason, like men, to print with the help of reflection, a wise direction to the movements of their bodies. The mind commands the body only to govern it by keeping it in the bonds of divine law. It is this divine law which teaches us that it is not advantageous to follow the impulses of the flesh, nor the suggestions of the enemy. God has given it to us as a powerful help to oppose the evil inspirations of the enemy, because a look at the law that commands good enough to make us understand that it is a

seducer whose advice is flagrant opposition with the teachings of the law. So we put a brake on our body and we temper that it is too hot giving him less freedom and weaning of the delights of life. Just as a body worked by fever increases the fire that devours it, under the influence of food or drink, thus the bodies which are burned by the ardor of the blood flare up even more violently if they are not well directed, the fire goes out for want of food. It is in the mind to drive the body. But if he lets him go according to his desires, the body will overthrow him like a horse carried off the rider who is not on his guard. Now, as this boiling ardor of the body becomes greater under the action of the enemies who exert on the soul their power of seduction, and it is not the body which desires, but which is satisfied by the heat which it is proper for him to suggest to the soul the desires which lose it, we must plead for the assistance of our God to protect and repress these desires, for we do not have to fight against flesh and blood, but against princes and powers; (Eph. 6:12) and once these enemies are removed, it will be easy for us to suppress the revolts of flesh and blood. A fire goes out when the fire can no longer find food. Now, the advocates of the error we are fighting here see the fulfillment of what astrologers tell us, who believe in the reality of their predictions. Here again is a trait of the deceitfulness of the demons, who endeavor to make the predictions of their priests so that their lies are not discovered. But all their efforts remain fruitless with regard to those who add no faith to their answers, for on the one hand they display less activity to win those who do not believe in them, and on the other hand God does not allow them to seduce those who put their trust in him and do not surrender to the ploys of the devil. By a wise disposition of Divine Providence, events are due to the faith of each, and in such a way as not to offend the free will of the will. Thus nothing can prevail against him who believes in God and pleads for his help; for he is assured that all the things he has done remain subject to his power, and cannot do anything against him who has been able to make himself favorable to God. It is a certain truth that God made the world, that He created the sun and the stars, by tracing them the way they should follow to regulate the actions of the human race; but will he say that he has not reserved the power to command them to do anything other than what he has prescribed from the beginning? No, they drew them from nothingness to be subject to his will, and they follow the path that has been designed to them, as long as they receive no contrary orders. But it also happens that God, flooded by the prayers of men, for whom he has created the

elements and the stars, commands time, puts an end to unwelcome rains, or makes fertility fruit that too much drought strikes with sterility; or again, when the criminal life of men, their disorders, their guilty pleasures which drag them away from what pleases God, are punished by a prolonged drought which produces famine on earth, as it happened under the prophets Elijah and Elisha. (1 Kgs. 18:4) God, appeased by repentance, pours abundant rains on the earth. The government of the world has some analogy with the government of the kingdoms of the earth. When the subjects of an empire groan under the tyranny of the provincial governors, they revert to the emperors for deliverance, so when men see the seasons and the elements declare themselves against them, they address their humble supplications to God who holds the whole universe in his power. This is not seen by astrologers. The stars, they say, must necessarily fulfill the laws which have been imposed on them, these laws cannot be revoked or changed, they follow fixed way that God has designed them. They claim, then, that destinies are permanent, and that God cannot grant anything here to the prayers of men, because he has established once and for all the order of the world and outlined to the stars a march which does not suffer from anticipation or delay. Such is the error of astrologers, an error which is injurious to God. Indeed, as a consequence of this assertion, they deny that nothing can be done against this order once established, and they refuse to believe in all the events of which the holy books teach us that God is the author as soon as they depart from the ordinary laws of the world. Thus it cannot be said that a virgin has become a mother, nor that the rod of Aaron has borne flowers and fruits (Num. 17: 8), nor that Sara has borne a son in her old age. (Gen. 21:2) These phenomena are not understood in the ordinary course of events, God operates them outside the order he has established. And what is so amazing that the Creator of the world did what the world cannot do? But, he says, he seems to destroy the order of which he is the author, going directly against the laws he has given to the world. Let us see, God has designed to the world the law which regulates the actions and the reproduction of the human race. Is it imposed on himself? It would be a humiliation for him to follow the laws he imposed on the world he created. And how would we understand that he is the Creator of the world, if he had followed in his actions the laws he gave to the world? It is therefore to make us understand that it is God and not the world who is the author of these extraordinary actions that he does them outside the order he has established. God

has commanded the sun to travel nonstop along the road he has designed without ever stopping; will the author of this law not have the right to arrest him himself? Judges are forbidden to revoke a sentence pronounced against a guilty party; is the sovereign himself subject to this law? How much more must we recognize in God the right to do what the world cannot do because he is the servant of the one who created him? The world, by virtue of the law which it receives, can give death, it cannot give back life, it can by a reprehensible action make a man blind, it cannot render him the use of sight; it can make a man weak, even sick, but he cannot cure him; it is an act of power which God has reserved to show that he is the sovereign master of all that exists. What a stronger argument against destiny than the resurrected dead, the one born blind recovering sight, the sick and the paralyzed cured, and other similar miracles that prove that destiny, if it exists, cannot form an obstacle for those who have recourse to God? In his epistle, the apostle St. John said: "He who is in us is greater than he who is in the world." (1 Jn. 4:4) God surrenders to our prayers, modifies in our favor his first designs. Has he not established as a law that the sinners should be punished? And yet he forgives them, if he is required, because he alone has the power to bind and loose. He commanded the sun never to suspend its course, and yet Joshua the son of Nave commanded it to stop, and the sun obeyed an order contrary to that which it had received in the organization of the system of the world. A still more extraordinary phenomenon occurred in Hezekiah, for in order that this prince should have no doubt of the promise made to him, the prophet gave him a new and unheard-of sign for human ears, he did not only command the sun to stop as in the first case, but to demote to convince Hezekiah that he who could make the ninth hour the sixth, could also add fifteen years of life. Thus the favor given to Hezekiah destroys the system of astrologers, for they deny that the life of man can be prolonged. God gives Hezekiah a sign which is no less contrary to their doctrine. It is impossible, they say, for the stars to follow another course than that which is traced to them. According to this doctrine, having a slave or not having one is something that depends on destiny. Indeed. Where were these destinies from the beginning of the world? For until the flood, and a long time afterwards, why do we see no trace of slavery and servitude? Does the existence of these fates date from the time of King Ninus, who first fought the war against the neighboring nations, and reduced to servitude those whom he had made captive? It is therefore a more recent

institution, not one of destiny, but the work of demons, for if it were the work of destiny, it would go back to the beginning of the world. Thus the existence of the stars dates from the origin of the world, and they never cease to accomplish their revolution. In the early days men loved the life of the fields, and they did not seek to become rich. How can astrologers argue that it is the stars that decide for men of wealth and poverty? Are the stars changed? No, it is the ploys and prestige of Satan who want us to attribute to the influence of stars what is done by the spirits that are submitted to it. As he approaches the time that must consume his ruin, he is studying to increase the number of his crimes. We know that famine has ravaged Italy, Africa, Sicily, Sardinia; that the astrologers tell us if all the inhabitants of these countries were subject to the same destiny, whereas by their admission, out of a hundred persons, we cannot find two similar destinies. Let them blush, let them keep silence, and extend supplicating hands to the God whose power extends over all that exists. But perhaps this is the one stolen from the action of destiny? What shall we say about Pannonia, which has been so devastated that it cannot come out of its ruins? Oh! that their weakness is great! and that because they are Christians of dubious faith. They doubt divine promises, and do not think of the facts that have been accomplished. If they considered all that the prophets and apostles had done, they would add no faith to the fables of astrologers. They would know that everything is subject to the power of God, and they will not fail at the misfortunes that come to the righteous, remembering that they will receive their reward in the last judgment, in the testimony of the Apostle: by many tribulations, he tells us, that we must enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Acts 14:21) What do Christians hope for by listening to astrologers when they hear the apostle Saint John say to them and shout to them: "Do not love this world or what is in this world?" (1 Jn. 2:15) If, then, our faith and Christian law makes us an obligation to love neither the world nor what is in the world, why do we see some of us saddened? and to complain of the temporal prosperity of others, a prosperity which in the eyes of God is perhaps a great misfortune? Should not they rather rejoice that the world has not chained them in bonds that would keep them enslaved to the things of the earth? This bliss which produces in the soul, I know not what security, makes it completely indifferent to divine things. Yes, negligence for the divine oracles is the necessary consequence of the abundance of the goods of the earth, because one then seems to have no more reason for attentiveness. Or rather, the

rich of the century are worked by other worries, it is to increase their fortune in this world and to rise even higher, which cannot be done without sin. If we examine things more closely, we shall see that the world is rather the enemy of those whom it seems to make happy. Indeed, there is hardly one among them who thinks of the goods of heaven. Christians must therefore rejoice when, despite an irreproachable life, they are unhappy in this world. He who truly triumphs over the world, who is content with all that happens to him below, never ceases to thank God for it; if he does not have all he can desire of the goods of the earth, he hopes that God reserves for him the goods of heaven. Why in fact did God establish the last judgment? It is to eternally reward those who have been unjustly oppressed for a time, and to lower and punish those who, by the abuse of their power, professed only contempt, even disbelief for the judgment of God, and hoped that their crimes would go unpunished. But the supporters of destiny deny future judgment. If the good ones as well as the bad ones are born what they are, what matter to your praises or your reproaches, since the good one has in no combat to support to obtain the victory and that the villain is not guilty of any negligence that is the cause of his loss? Why do they seek to spread their fables individually? The guilty men cited before the judges have never dared to blame their destiny for their crimes; they confess them quite the contrary and do not think of accusing of injustice the sentence which condemns them. The authority of the law thus radically destroys this doctrine of fatality, and the name alone cannot be pronounced before the action of the law. Now, how can those whose life is a matter of crime hope to enjoy eternal freedom, because they strive to escape for a time to the severity of the divine law, without thinking that the author of the law cannot always conceal? There, indeed, we have the image of the law; it is the truth, and whoever mocks the image cannot make fun of the truth. Is there in the whole world a place where God is not, and can anyone hope to escape his hands? They think to the point of imagining that one is safe as soon as one has managed to escape them here below. How can they think that they will escape punishment while others are punished for similar crimes? It cannot be denied that God in creating the world did not give him the law he was to follow. His affection for his work inspired him to teach men the way to life and the guides under whose guidance they had to walk, because it is also a path to death. Now, must he not inquire whether those whom he has established, the ministers of his kingdom, have governed his people according to the rules he has

laid down, or whether this people has received their ordinances with submission, or whether the ministers who have been recognized as worthy of praise, or whether the wrongdoers have been punished as they deserve? The people also receive praise if they observe the law, or a sentence of condemnation if they have despised it. Justice, reason so require it. How is it, then, that cannot suffer the idea of future judgment? This is still one of the fruits of the extravagance of astrologers. How could they believe in the judgment of the future who are wrong with the present judgment, because for them the cause of judgment is entirely in the birth? But if birth alone deserves to be rewarded or punished, how are those who claim that it is not by the effect of a natural judgment, but by their mere birth, that men become good or bad, are they enough empty of reason to punish those who hurt and leave no unpunished fault? Indeed, we see them hitting the rods and chaining even inside their homes those outside they say they were born unable to correct themselves. But never does a wise man seek to correct or recapture those he knows are incapable of correction? it would be an act of madness or injustice. And let them not say that they act so driven by destiny; he who is subject to destiny does not do what he wants; and they naturally punish those who are naturally incapable of conversion, for it is true to say that all that is attributed to destiny can be regarded as an act of madness. But what extravagance to affirm on one side that a man is born bad and not to esteem the goodness of the one whom they claim to be born good? How can one look as good as one who is surprised by the flagrant crime of injustice? And what is more unjust than to accuse of iniquity that which one recognizes to have been able to do nothing but what he has done? Moreover, if everything is subject to accident, why has the law come into being to oppose these actions, which depend, it is said, on destiny? That the law is about to disappear, all crimes will occur in broad daylight; we can no longer support the powerful, there will be no more freedom; for he who now does not think of evil, having no fear to hold him back, will abandon himself to vice. Besides, we read that it was to repress evil that the law was given, but perhaps it was also by an effect of accident that it was given. And how can this accident exist if it begets what must destroy it? All that is presented as dependent on destiny, the law forbids doing so. These destinies are therefore devoid of reason if they produce things which are contrary to them. They are unjust because they only give birth to men for damnation, and if they are unjust, they must have no authority, for all that is unjust is worthy of punishment.

Will they say that the law is absolutely useless, because the one born to be necessarily bad cannot be improved by the law? If it is so, it is a pure waste that the law has been given, and how destinies could have given birth to a thing absolutely useless, since nothing is done only by destiny? Destinies therefore act for themselves and against them at the same time, and if it is so, we cannot admit as reasonable what has so little constancy and firmness. Will it be said that destinies have sought to give the law to have the law condemned by those whom they cause to be necessarily bad, because it seemed to them proper to attribute punishment to him? To this I have only one answer to make, is that laws and destinies deserve to be condemned by their own judgment if both, by the same injustice, conspire to kill those who are born bad not by their will but by the action of accident. The law, moreover, declares itself here against the destinies which themselves pronounce against them the sentence of condemnation; for they do not deny that those who are evil are so by the action of destiny. Now, the law is so opposed to this doctrine of fatalism that it denies that the wicked are bad otherwise than by their will, so it is with justice that it condemns them to rigorous restraints. There is therefore nothing in common between law and destiny, since the law denies what destiny claims. But under what influence were born those who defended the astrologers the stay in the city of Rome? It is known that this defense was long in force, and it was the pagans who had carried it. How to attribute to destiny what is done against destiny? But if destiny really exists, it cannot act against itself. Those who act against destiny are not subject to destiny, and if they are freed from it, there is no destiny, no accident. But, it will be said to me, there is at least for each one a destiny which determines the kind of death of which he must die. If this is so, we must not accuse the homicides, because they will have this double defense that they acted under the impulse of their destinies, as the ones they killed were put to death under of this same destiny. But here again the law is at fault, since it punishes the homicide when it is known. The adulterous man and woman born also subject to this fatality, as well as the one whose rights are harmed by adultery. Now, if we must admit this consequence, the law is still reprehensible here, since it punishes adulterers. If adultery was a necessary consequence of destiny, it would be necessary to understand in punishment the man whose destiny is to suffer adultery; for he really participates in this crime, because his destiny is cause that he consents to adultery so it was of all justice to either condemn them

or declare them both innocent. Thus the law seems here opposed to justice. If, then, destinies have God as author, the law does not come from God, for he is unworthy, not only of God, but of a wise man to condemn what he has done. But no one has ever dared to accuse the law or to deny its divine origin. It cannot be maintained, therefore, that destinies have God as author, since God punishes them by the law. Indeed, to condemn the actions that are made under the impulse of destinies is without doubt to have condemn the destinies themselves. But evil souls, they say, are born to do evil; but these bad souls should not be born under a destiny that compels them to kill the innocent. If these souls are essentially evil, they should not come into the world, but be punished rather than be a cause of death for the innocent. But in reality it is not the souls they suppose to be evil that are a cause of ruin for the innocent, but the destinies which condemn men to this ruin by the mere fact of their birth. It is not, then, the souls, but the destinies which must be accused of injustice here; but if they are unjust, they do not come from God; it is therefore from the devil that they derive their origin, and by a necessary consequence they deserve to be condemned with him. These destinies assign to each one the kind of death which must end its days, either by iron or by the torture of the rope, or by falling from an elevated place, or by shipwreck; in the same kind of death the circumstances cannot be more varied. No one can have a destiny different from that of all other men. If this difference exists, it is no longer destiny, but at random that it must be attributed. And if chance finds its place in the death of a single man, he can have an equal share in the death of a greater number, and then we can no longer attribute it to destiny. Anaxagoras<sup>1</sup> was crushed alive in a mortar by the orders of a tyrant; no other would have a similar destiny. A woman thrust a nail into the temple of Sisara, king of the Canaanites<sup>2</sup>, who was killed in this manner during her sleep; no one died that way. (Judg. 4: 21) In the past, men were crucified, a torment which is now defended by the laws. If this ordeal had been established by fate, how could it have stopped? When a thing which is the work of destiny is prohibited and not done, destiny is as chained. Now, if destiny had no part in this torment, it was exclusively by virtue of the judgment of the law that men were subjected to the punishment of the cross. And by the fact it is so, it is not destiny which makes men condemn, but the crimes of which they are convinced. It was formerly said, among the Etruscans, a man of ravishing and incomparable beauty; this man was virtuous, and as he attracted the eyes of even

the most honest women, to ward off all suspicion he seized seven wounds on his face to destroy that beauty which made him the object of general attention. It was thus that he triumphed over destinies, so long as destiny must be admitted. Perhaps it will be said to me: It was nature that gave him this beauty at birth, and it was destiny that inspired him to resolve to delineate himself. But then destiny is for nothing in the birth, it is the result of a simple accident. Now, if it is an accident, it is not to destiny that it must be attributed, but to a determination, or perhaps to a contingency as to the other circumstances of the main fact. What is conquering destiny? Does not it change the nature? But if destiny truly existed, he could not experience fault or change. It is reported as a fact in a law book that a woman brought to light five children; how could nature alone have given him this fruitfulness against destiny, which cannot be the cause of it? If destiny was somewhere, other women would have shared this fertility. We read again that a man, leaving for a distant journey, confided his wife to a friend of whom he knew the fidelity, and who was no longer young, but in the maturity of age. To be a foolproof guardian, he submitted to an operation that allowed him to sleep under the same roof as this woman without arousing the slightest suspicion. Was this conduct the effect of destiny or of a definite resolution? But how to attribute to destiny an action which is contrary to it? They are forced to admit, no doubt, that it is in the attributions of destinies that a man is learned or ignorant. All senators are therefore subject to the same destiny, for all without exception are literate, and the uneducated, as all slaves are born under the same destiny, because no slave is a senator. But if we call destiny that which is born with man, what is added next is therefore outside of destiny. Or if we attribute this quality to destiny, why do we acquire it only through work? I would understand that destiny was a cause if it came to man against his will; for what happens without having been foreseen is put in the account of destiny; but how can I attribute to it that which is the fruit of ripe reflections, long meditations, great efforts? Here is a man who is born a eunuch, others become so; where will destiny be here? No doubt in the one who is a eunuch by birth; but what about those who become it? Because there is a great difference between being born and becoming. If it is by virtue of destiny that some have become eunuchs, it is against the decrees of destinies that others are born. And why do we see so few who are eunuchs of birth, so much so that the fact seems incredible? It is related of a woman who lived in the city of Rome that she had

eleven husbands, and a man whom he had up to twelve wives. What are the destinies that have set these exceptional conditions for them? Here is a certain fact that took place during the reign of Emperor Constantine. A young girl from Campania was changed into a man and driven to Rome; which destinies were the cause of this phenomenon? Others, no doubt, you do not know. Oh! if you cease to pronounce this name and leave more to eventualities and circumstances, you would give more to foresight. The strength and industry of the human spirit are so great that it not only resists nature, but is likely to become better or remain what it is because it has received from God this faculty. It is said that the Scythian women, who are called Amazons, seeing the prolonged absence of their husbands, engaged in distant wars, united with their slaves to have children, and put them to death all the male children to keep only the girls, to whom they forbade the work of the wool to train them from their youth in the exercises of the struggle and the handling of arms. They displayed such great energy in the conduct of affairs, that during a reign of several years they subjugated entire nations, and made the whole of Asia tributary. What to say to that? That these extraordinary facts, which lasted for a long succession of years, are the work of fate, to annihilate thus that which is ordinarily attributed to it? Thus, first of all, it is contrary to nature that women take the reins of the kingdom in defiance of their marriages; secondly, that they have united with their slaves; thirdly, that they put all male children to death to keep only the girls. Their prosperity was so great that this kingdom, which they had founded without the help of their husbands, took extraordinary growth during a long and glorious succession of years. Now, it had never been seen since the beginning of the world, except in Scythia. They may say that the world, being renewed after a period of fourteen hundred years, these things are reproduced in their time; but it is six thousand years since the world existence; at what time did this example find imitators? Crassus was nicknamed Agelastus because he was only seen laughing once in his life. Why was Junius nicknamed Brutus? Because he had the good idea to counterfeit the fool for not being put to death by Tarquin the Superb, who coveted his immense fortune. In Constantine's time, a man named Samatius defied the madman for thirty years to annoy the Emperor, as he later said himself. Where is the action of destiny? It is obviously destroyed because everyone does what he wants. But how can we explain the conduct of the supporters of destiny, which address to God fervent supplications which are directly contrary to

destiny? They pray to recommend the years of their lives, their unions, their travels; they consult and pray when they want to make an acquisition or obtain dignity. If all this depends on destiny, why pray for these supplications to get something that will happen even in spite of you? But I'm trying to find out, do you tell me, if I have to accept. It is not, therefore, destiny which decides the conduct which you must hold, if you learn that there is utility for you. If destiny is here the master, your research is great, whether you like it or you do not want it, whether you want to know it or not, you will necessarily do that. But as they are unsure of what they say, they try to resort to dubious things so as not to find a different truth from their opinions. Here, however, are the wisest of them explaining their conduct: When we pray, they say, we do not have in view destinies that are absolutely unchallengeable, we know, but events that are close to destiny and that could be contrary to us. But, I ask them in my turn, I do not know whether this man was born under a favorable destiny, and he has near him events which seem likely to make him unhappy; what will happen, in fact, since you support the immutability of the good as the bad destiny? You pray to remove from yourself the unfortunate influence of what is close to destiny, inevitable influence without prayer; how then can you sustain the immutability of destiny, while you fear what is near destiny, for finally you have no reason to fear, if you do not think that destiny can change its decrees? But as the main point of your doctrine is to support the immutability of destiny, your prayers are therefore without motive. Examine, however, whether the object of your supplications does not depend on destiny, since all that you attribute to destiny is free from evil. Prayer is certainly not a bad thing; why not assign it to destiny? If, then, prayer enters into the decrees of destiny, then why does this prayer does not obtain its effect? If he is really part of destiny, he must get what he asks for. If, on the other hand, destiny both commands and renders prayer without effect, he is a fool, since it forces the man to ask what he knows he cannot be granted. If he does not know that the prayer of man can obtain what he asks him to do, it is carelessness which denotes the absence of reason, because all ignorance indicates a lack of sense, and the lack of sense is of madness. The pagan system collapses here entirely. Let them be enveloped in the darkness that robs them of the sight of light, victims of their ancient error, they refuse to listen to the truth that was hidden from them. But what shall we say of certain Christians who want to apply to the Savior by changing only the name, the

vanity of this old error, and who push extravagance to claim that God himself was subjected to destiny by relying on these words of the Savior: "My hour is not yet come," (Jn. 2:4) as if this hour was not voluntarily chosen, but a necessity imposed upon it by fate, although He declared that he had set himself the time when he wanted to be delivered to his enemies. Did he not say, and I have the power to give my life, and I have the power to take it back?" (Jn. 10:18) The fatal necessity is thus erased before the power of the will. And how could we still call him our Savior, if all our actions, all the events of our life are subject to destiny? We call him our Savior, because He has shown us the way of salvation. Now, if this path has been revealed to us since its advent, it is not destiny that is the cause that it has remained unknown till then. What depends on destiny, their confession, arrives without being foreseen. On the contrary, we must recognize the action of faith that cannot be attributed to destiny, because what it believes today has not been known in previous centuries. Destinies, they say, dispose of events which compose the ordinary life of men. Now, how could we attribute to them something they have certainly ignored? This is why the Apostle says: "even the hidden wisdom, which none of the princes of this world knew." (1 Cor. 2:8) It is these princes and powers who have the evil angels under them, and who, whenever they can, satisfy their passions under the name of destiny, just as the wicked make their own confession. Among men it is that they love, others they do not like, others they hate. Each of them suggests to men what he likes, according to their different inclinations; they inspire in some the passion of various guilty pleasures, in others the love of the present, to them the pleasure, to these are fear and anger, to a few avarice; for some they are a cause of gain, for others of damage; some share in benevolence, others in hatred and the difficulties they cause. At certain times they are as satisfied and take a few moments of rest; sometimes this rest is calculated, sometimes they refrain from insinuating themselves into a strongly occupied soul, for they have no absolute authority, but they look for the favorable occasion to make us fall into their snares. We have the free use of our will; but as soon as certain desires come to diminish our vigilance over ourselves, these spirits of malice hasten to solicit us to evil; but especially if they find us occupied with thoughts contrary to divine law, they come to lend us a hand to make us commit what the law forbids. If the fear of God is rooted in the soul, neither the flesh, nor the blood, nor the princes, nor the powers can prevail, for the help of God will make it so powerful against them, that

it will triumph over them without sentence. If we do not have the free use of our will, why this recommendation of Our Lord: "Ask, and it will be given to you, because everyone who asks receives?" (Matt. 7:7) If, therefore, he who consents to ask must receive, we can no longer say that we do not have what we want, but only what is given to us, since the Savior excites our will to ask by promising him that he will receive this. What demand. If, on the other hand, destiny is the only master of our actions, whether we ask for it or not, the good or evil that happens must be attributed to destiny. Our Lord destroys this consequence when he says: "My daughter, your faith has saved you." (Matt. 9:22) Destiny has nothing to do here, since it is faith that receives the benefit of healing. He says elsewhere: "If you believe, all things are possible to him who believes." (Mark 9:22) It is in the will that he places merit, because in fact it is a good of faith and not of nature. Faith is a virtue that joins the will to excite it to the practice of good; it is not in nature, but the will that is part of our nature makes the faith it has received effective and meritorious to God. The nature of man is like the stone which does not contain fire as one of its natural properties, but which nevertheless has power in it, which produces in reality the fire which it seems not to have, as long as it does not exist. It only has it in seed, that is to say in power, it is the action which must give birth to it; without this action it cannot exist; as if the seed is not cultivated, it produces nothing, it remains alone. It is therefore the action that adds to it that makes it fertile. Thus man does not have faith as the property of his nature, but he has in him the seed of faith; if this seed is not excited, stimulated, it will not produce any fruit, that is, it will not produce faith. Christians, believing in the destiny of astrologers, destroy the seed of faith that bears witness to the Creator and his righteousness. The work knows its author, and rightly testifies its existence by his love as by his actions. We therefore exhort you to flee by all means this wicked doctrine. Its followers are the enemies of God and never have a moment of tranquility, for they are always anxiously awaiting events of which they are by no means certain. For us, on the other hand, who believe that God can only be a source of happiness for us, and that he can remove from us by his will all the contrary events, we are faithful to prayer, in the assurance we have of his protection, and by reminding ourselves that if, while doing good, we go through a few trials, our patience in supporting them will deserve a more glorious crown.

(1) It was not Anaxagoras, but Anaxarchus, Greek philosopher of the school of Democritus, that Nicocreon, tyrant of Cyprus, had him crushed alive by mortar to avenge himself for an injury he had received.

(2) Sisara was not king, but general of the army of Jabin, king of Canaanites. (Judg. 4)

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 120. ON FASTING.** — It is a duty, my dear brothers, for the priest of God, who is at the head of the people of Jesus Christ, to instruct in sound doctrine the people who are entrusted to him, according to the recommendation of the Apostle (Tit. 1:9), so that we carry out with scrupulous vigilance and with as much religion as zeal the work of faith required by the circumstances of our time. You are not unaware of the usefulness of the children we are going to celebrate as Easter approaches, but it is our duty to inform you of them. Devotion can only win to meditate again what she already knows. Such, indeed, is the disposition of nature that it lets itself go to lukewarmness if it neglects the use of reading. Iron that is rarely used produces rust, so sins are born in a soul that is not exercised by holy readings. This is why the Psalmist proclaims blessed the one who meditates the law of the Lord night and day. Although we know the divine oracles, yet when they are recalled to us by the holy books, the truly religious soul receives them as if they were hearing them for the first time. This reading awakens in her desire (the works of salvation), which is what the Apostle recommended to his disciple Timothy: "Revive the grace that is in you." (2 Tim. 1:6) Fasting is therefore as necessary as remedies are for wounds, it becomes for us the teacher of eternal life, on the condition, however, that we should be accompanied by these two testimonials of recommendation, prayer and mercy, intemperance of the body, it represses the contrary movements, it discharges the soul of the weight which consents it, as our Lord says: "Do not indulge in the excesses of the table and the debauchery, lest your hearts be heavy." (Luke 21:34) It is when the soul knows how to beware of the immoderate use of food and drink that it knows itself better. As in a mirror tarnished by uncleanness man cannot see himself as he is, likewise if he is heavy with the excess of drinking and eating, he feels very different from what he is. It is then that passion awakens, that anger comes on, that pride flares

up, that passion produces its unhappy fruits. This is why the Apostle makes this recommendation to the Ephesians: "Do not let yourself be intoxicated by the wine from which the dissolution is born." (Eph. 5:18) If, on the contrary, the ardor of the body is moderated by fasting, the soul who covers the full knowledge of itself knows with what pious eagerness it must obey its Redeemer. Fasting is therefore greatly needed. Esther was on the throne when the Jewish people were threatened with the greatest danger; she was delivered by fasting. (Esther 4:7) The Ninevites had heard the prediction of the prophet who fixed the day of their destruction; they ordered a general fast which saved them from this inevitable ruin. (Jonah 3:7) Whenever the righteous and the prophets wanted some favor from God, they humbled themselves by fasting, to David's testimony: "I humbled my soul in fasting." (Ps. 34:13) The Savior Himself, to whom fasting was not necessary, fasted to give us the example. (Matt. 4:2) So no one doubts the usefulness of fasting, and it is by fasting that man shows that he wants to obtain what he asks. This is why we read in Scripture, "Prayer is good with fasting." (Tob. 12:8) Prayer, to be pleasing, therefore needs to be accompanied by fasting. But these two conditions receive all their strength only from justice; also the Holy Spirit adds: "And alms with righteousness," that is to say, alms joined to righteousness renders almighty prayer with fasting. This is the practice of mercy which made the prayer and fasting of Cornelius so effective, that man, in the midst of abundance, practiced fasting, and fed the needy, that their appeased appetite might render his fast acceptable to God. It is therefore necessary both to give and to take away the fast so that he can obtain what he asks.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 121. PRAISE AND GLORY OF THE PASSOVER.** — O truly holy and salutary day of the feast of the Passover, a day worthy of all praise, where death has been vanquished, the reign of the demon destroyed, the mysteries of God revealed, the decree pronounced against us canceled, the gates of hell broken, the chains broken, day that gave freedom to the prisoners, sight to the blind, knowledge to the ignorant, forgiveness of sins to the unjust and sinners, day that reconciled the enemies, dispelled the errors, manifested the truth, he gave back to

God the children he had lost, lowered pride, raised humility, enriched the poor, robbed the rich, flattened the mountains and hills, filled the valleys, crushed arrogance, adorned modesty, opened to souls the way to heaven, made freedom, broke the chains of captivity, cast out darkness, confounded mischief, purified all defilements, wiped out the power of Satan and hell, made Our Lord Jesus Christ appear as the true Son of God, lifted up the flesh to heaven by confounding the power of the world and showing that heaven, earth, and hell were under the power of one and the same God. We must, therefore, my dear brothers, celebrate and honor this day in the feelings of a deep religion joined to the purity of life and to the joy of the soul, avoiding all that is contrary to modesty and decency, in order to be able to gather the true fruit of the Passover feast by Our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom belongs honor and glory for ever and ever.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 124. THE SAME WORK FOLLOWING PEOPLE MAY BE DIFFERENT AND WORTHY OF PRAISE OR CONDEMNATION.** — The virtue of mercy is the same in the rich as in the poor, but it is appreciated differently in the rich than in the poor, that is to say that it is more worthy of praise in the poor than in the rich. The poor man did not fear to give much of the little he had, in the hope that God would return it to him with reward in the present and in the future. He had faith in this word of Scripture: "He who gives to the poor will never be in need." (Prov. 28:27) This is why this poor woman deserved to be praised by the Lord alone, while many rich people threw large sums into the chest of the temple, because she was not afraid to give to the deprivation. The rich give, assured that they are of their great riches; the poor give with all their confidence in God. The rich do well by giving freely to the needy, but the poor make it a much more meritorious work, and by the same the reward of the poor is different from that of the rich. If the rich do not exercise mercy, he will be punished, while it is not required of the poor. So a poor man who is merciful is worthy of all praise. Theft is a sin in the poor as in the rich, but it makes the rich more guilty, because the poor have been driven by his poverty, while the rich in abundance, not satisfied with what he has he seizes the good of others, and what is even worse, strips the

poor of the little they possess, so the trouble that awaits them is different. The virtue of justice is the same in the poor as in the rich, but it is much more meritorious in the poor. Observing the rules of justice in poverty is heroic. As for the rich man, he seems faithful to the laws of justice because he is far from poverty. Both are therefore just, but there is much more merit in practicing justice in poverty. Pride is always a vice, but it is much more reprehensible in the poor than in the rich, because abundance enfolds the heart of the rich, while the poor is superb even in poverty, which is almost an act of madness; so the poor man is more guilty. Humility is a virtue in both, but it is much more worthy of praise in the rich who practice it. What is so great a merit for the poor man to appear humble, while poverty itself inspires humility? But what is truly admirable is to see him whom his dignities and his riches elevate above other men to lower and humble himself without bringing back to himself the honors he knows he deserves. Humility is therefore good in all, but it is more meritorious in the person of the rich. Knowledge and learning are always admirable, but much more so in the rich than in the poor. The poor man, who had no title to the consideration of his fellows, applied himself strongly to acquire what could reconcile their esteem. The rich, on the contrary, who already enjoyed this consideration, has sought to increase it by his work, to make himself useful for two reasons, and his riches did not divert him from the work which was to acquire him this personal distinction. He is, therefore, more worthy of praise than the poor, who, without this application to study, would have nothing to draw from his obscurity. On one side, therefore, it is the will, on the other the necessity which has developed this love of knowledge. Sobriety is reprehensible in the poor as well as in the rich, but it is much more so in the poor. Poverty should serve to divert the poor from guilty pleasures; he should think that he has no reason to satisfy them, and that the eagerness with which he seeks the means necessarily leads him into a multitude of evils which he cannot avoid, even here below, unfortunate consequences; or by lavishing without reason what he possesses, he will fall into a shameful and unanswered poverty. The abundance of riches, on the contrary, is a seductive attraction which excites the rich to indulge in pleasure; besides, the rich are assured of exemption, for they know that justice is corruptible and that nobody will dare to condemn them. Who would dare to condemn a man who presents himself with the double investment of dignity and wealth? Their desires are therefore more keen and their passions more violent. Far

from being taken back, they are in great honor and can even boast of their vices. If the rich and the poor are both chaste, the chastity of one is very different from the chastity of the other. For the poor, the baseness of his condition or the fear of the laws suffice to prevent him from indulging in the desires of his heart; the rich man, on the contrary, whom so many attractions solicit for vice, is much more worthy of praise if he turns his mind away from it. The chastity of the rich deserves therefore a greater reward than that of the poor. That a king on the throne moderates his passions, nothing more glorious; he can do anything and does nothing he knows he can do with freedom. The one really fears God, and keeps his precepts, who is the master of the laws and sets his eyes on the future judgment. It is therefore a truly heroic work for one who has no one to fear here below, to overcome the seductive lures of pleasure, attractions all the more powerful, it seems above the fear of the present evils and to come. So it is a very meritorious action to overcome pleasure, but especially for those who are above the law and men. For others, the fear of laws and their kind keeps them in duty. In order not to expose themselves to confusion before men, they persevere in the path of good and refrain from transgressing the laws to avoid condemnation. He, on the contrary, that his elevation sets above the laws of men, covers himself with glory by abstaining from evil.

## 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 126. FROM THE ONE WHO RECEIVED THE FAITH OF JESUS CHRIST.** — It is written, "The righteousness of the righteous shall be of no use unto him in the day when he shall turn aside from the right way; and the iniquity of the sinner shall not be detrimental to him, when he shall do penance for his sins." (Ezek. 18) The Lord also says in his Gospel; "He who does not believe is already judged." (Jn. 3:18) By a necessary consequence, he teaches us that he who believes will not be subject to judgment to be condemned, but that the merit of his faith will make him worthy of praise and glory. The knowledge of God therefore has this prerogative to obtain the remission of sins. Indeed, he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God becomes worthy of being delivered from all his sins. For a long time lost in the paths of error and tossed by the flows of ignorance, he finally

sees in his eyes the splendor of the truth in which, after so much agitations and storms, he finds an assured rest. Now, having thus been enlightened by this light, it is his duty to abstain from the mistakes he committed when he was still in the darkness of ignorance. Would he use this knowledge if he keeps the habits of his old life? A certain mark of the knowledge of God in a soul is the change of life and the return to good. In fact, the knowledge of God must inspire the fear of the just judge, in whose court he teaches us that the faithful will receive the reward of their righteousness, and the ungodly, that is to say the unbelievers, the just punishment of their infidelity. It is of all justice, indeed, that the good ones be filled with joy in the future life in which Jesus Christ must reign with his chosen ones. They have been exposed to scorn, outrages in this world where the devil reigns, they will appear surrounded by glory in the kingdom of Jesus Christ for which they have borne the contempt of the worldly. Sinners, on the contrary, who seemed to shine here below a false brilliance, opposing falsehood to truth, have to wait for tribulation and an imaginary glory to succeed for them a contempt, a humiliation too real. The righteous will rejoice in having believed, when they witness the chastisements of the unbelieving, and the unfaithful will repent of their unbelief only when they see both their own chastisement and the glory of those whose faith they had regarded as an act of madness, which was only worthy of their contempt. From then on, when one professed to be a Christian, one must apply oneself to avoid sin and to arm oneself against vices. And as it is impossible to always win the victory, the one who has allowed himself to be conquered must be saddened if he does not want to experience another defeat, because to be defeated to be vanquished is to escape the consequences of the defeat. Whoever resists, finds in this resistance an excuse, if he comes to be vanquished. Because he shows that he had the desire to win the victory, but that desire has not had its effect. We can hope, then, that he will rise again, and that a persevering meditation will make him more skillful and stronger in combat. To rise again only to sin again is to commit a very grave fault, which remains without excuse. The one who has enlisted in the service of God, and who has kept the will to sin, is far more guilty than the one in ignorance where he is of God leads a life ashamed and defiled of all kinds of crimes. One does not know who he must fear, the other knows him and does not fail to scorn. Those who embrace the faith receive the remission of their sins, yet they will obtain the glory promised to them only on the condition of joining to the faith they have

received the fear of God, to fight against the enemies of the name to win the victory over them in order to obtain the reward that God has in store for those who have been more often victorious than conquered. As for the one who knows God and who does not want to embrace the faith so as not to be forced to live Christianly, but who only wants to receive the faith at the end of his life to die as a Christian, where he blushes to carry out a Christian life, where he wants to give himself up to the sins of which he hopes to obtain remission when he believes, I declare that the conduct of this man is not good, because it is to sin more freely throughout his life that he does not want to become a Christian or live as a Christian, or he blushes to become a Christian. What can he hope from God, under whose standard he blushes to fight, while claiming to receive from him the wages of his sons? This man literally makes fun of God. The approaching death makes him understand that he has no time left to sin; then he wants to be a Christian, and it is when he is reduced to the helplessness of sinning that he declares he wants to embrace the faith in Jesus Christ who has sin in horror, that is to say, it is not the will but the power of sinning that takes away the death that threatens him; it is to these men that we must recall this truth: "We do not mock God." (Gal. 6:7) What are the recommendations of these kinds of people? It is that they are only given the sacrament of faith when they are at the end, almost without knowledge and about to give up their last sigh, so much do they fear to come back and blush at being become Christians. We must therefore remind them of these words of the Gospel: "He," says the Lord, "who is ashamed to confess me in the midst of this generation, the Son of Man will also be ashamed of him when he comes in the glory of his Father. (Matt. 10:33, Mark 8:38, Luke 9:26 and 12:8.) They may say, We know the fragility of the human race, that's why we want to receive faith at the end of life so as not to expose him to the defilements of sin. I answer that when one embraces faith, or must know what one receives. It cannot produce its effect in the soul unless it is known and professed openly. "We must believe in our hearts to obtain justice," says St. Paul, "and to confess by mouth to obtain salvation." (Rom. 10:10). Now, how can one say of the one who does not already know where he is, that he has received the faith? To receive the faith is to profess that one has received it, because one knows what one has received. If they believe that the remission of sins is given to those who embrace the faith, they must also know that one truly believes only so much as the heart bears witness to the faith. God, who promises

this remission of sins, examines the heart, and welcomes only the one whom he sees from the bottom of his heart. But how can one reap the fruits of faith when the heart does not even understand the words of faith? He therefore becomes a Christian and embraces faith with reflection and prudence, which does so only to avoid sin more easily. The one, on the contrary, who wants to keep the freedom to sin, does not want to embrace the faith so as not to be forced to lead a Christian life, which he does not want. He wants to receive the benefit of faith to death, so he hopes for exemption and the remission of his past sins, and he is in full security for the past as for the future, since the approaching death was the opportunity to sin. But this resolution has neither a good reason nor a pure conscience for principle, since we do not want to embrace faith, not when we will not want it, but when we can no longer sin. It is to these kinds of people that these words are applied: "Let us do evil, that good may come," (Rom. 3:8), that is to say, sin now, we will embrace the faith in the last hour and our sins will be forgiven, so the Apostle adds, "These people will be justly condemned." For it is not right that sins be forgiven to those who know God who defends sin, and abhors sinners, yet retain a strong desire to sin; without thinking that the gift of God can be useful only to those who sin through ignorance of God and who do not know that God must judge the actions of men. But for him who has received the teachings of faith and has meditated on them, and who is nevertheless determined to sin, not under the constraint of a cause under which he succumbs, but by a determined will to sin, it is difficult to forgive him. There are two causes to which the forgiveness of sins, the free gift of God, and penance are attached, so that he who sins again after receiving grace may be renewed by penance. He did not know how to persevere in the grace which he had received and which guaranteed him freedom, but he threw himself back into the servitude of sin, so he resorted to moans and tears to make sure that his sin was erased, for he sinned knowingly, not without doubt that we can never be absolutely ignorant of sin; but he who does not know that God must one day judge the actions of men, believes that exemption is assured to his sin. If, therefore, a pagan falls ill, and seeing his desperate state, he reflects in himself on the promises which faith and hope gives, he finds himself in excellent conditions, so that his sins may be forgiven him as soon as he sincerely believes and no longer has to fear being held in the underworld because he carries the sign of victory over death, although he has no right to dignity or reward of Christians. It must be,

indeed, that there is a difference between the one who under the impulse of the love of God did not fear to fight his enemies by arming himself with continence and vigilance against vices, in order to be able to resist evil, and to solicitly defend the rights and authority of his God, and he who after having made common cause with the enemies of his Lord, returns to him at the end of his life, not to support the interests of God, but to obtain the personal privilege of being a citizen of his kingdom before being a soldier. Whoever wants to lead a Christian life to obtain the reward after his death, knows that the sufferings of this life have no proportion to the glory that will one day bring out in us. (Rom. 8:18) So do not hesitate to put on the armor of faith and fight against princes and powers to win the victory in this world and the crown of triumph in the other. It is right that whoever has defended the rights of the kingdom of his Lord in the midst of those who are malicious and rebels, receive in the other life the reward of his courage. In fact, the enemies of God seeing this faithful witness of Jesus Christ covered with glory in the kingdom of God for having confessed the truth, will be grieved and confused at having regarded it as a false thing, which had all the characters of truth; as well as those who have been slow to embrace the faith, and who have confessed God not in their lives, but to their death, seeing the glowing glory of those who under the armor of Jesus Christ fought for him with dedication and delicacy will remember not having lived, but only being dead as a Christian. Cannot we even say that he who has not the desire to live as a Christian, was hardly disposed to die as a Christian? Perhaps, in fact, he wanted to receive the name of a Christian who was about to die, because he no longer had time to sin. What Christians believe, he said, perhaps true, I want to become a Christian, without losing anything, if I am deceived in my faith. As at the moment of death, it is not the will to sin that ceases, but the sin itself, it wants to try if faith can serve him after death, while what would have been really useful to him was to work to correct his sins and vices the same where he committed them. The best proof indeed, that one condemns one's past faults, is to follow the line that traces faith, and to change one's life and habits. He who sinned because he did not know God, must not sin when he knows him, or this knowledge is completely useless to him. The knowledge of God must raise a soul to perfection. A Christian before making a profession must understand that the best proof that he is a Christian is not the name he bears, it is his works. That is why God gives Christians superior commandments to other laws, commandments tend to elevate

Him to holiness and form the true worship of God. If they neglect these commands, they will deserve to hear this reproach: "Why do you call me Lord, Lord, and do not do what I say?" (Luke 6:46) He declares by that that it is useful to call him Lord, if we keep his commandments, for it is mocking him to give him the name of Lord, while despising His precepts, so that we must remember these words of the Apostle: "We do not mock God." He will therefore be condemned by his own words, because he calls Lord the one for whom he has no fear at the testimony of his works.

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT

**QUESTION 11. IF IT IS IN PUNISHMENT FOR THEIR UNBELIEF AND THEIR MURMURINGS THAT THE JEWS HAVE RECEIVED HARSHER COMMANDMENTS, WHAT HAVE THEIR CHILDREN DONE WRONG TO BE BOUND THEMSELVES TO THE OBSERVANCE OF THESE PRECEPTS?**

— The law was given to the fathers to be a burden to their sons who were to be like them; for, not content to equal, they surpassed the offenses of which their fathers were guilty against God. Now God in his foreknowledge saw their children above all by giving them this law, because all the others died in the wilderness.

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 1. WHY WERE THE ACTIONS AND WORDS OF THE LORD WRITTEN BY FOUR DIFFERENT AUTHORS?** — It was fitting that the blessed year of the Lord, as the Prophet put it, should be included in four volumes, as in four seasons. Just as the course of the year is composed of four seasons which follow one another, so the words and actions of the Lord are contained in four books which complement each other, and which together form a perfect fullness. Now, the reason these books have been written by four different authors is so that each gospel would have a different name, as each season, distinct from the others. If they seem to present some contradiction in the words, this contradiction always disappears before an explanation related to the subject; just as the seasons differ in

name, air temperature, and the course of the stars, but are in accord with the result which is to give rise to all the productions of the earth.

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY NT

**QUESTION 2. SINCE IT IS CERTAIN THAT WE HAVE FOUR AUTHENTIC BOOKS OF THE FACTS AND WORDS OF OUR LORD, IN WHAT ORDER SHOULD WE PLACE THEM?** — The classification of the four Gospels is determined more by the order of the subjects than by the time they were written. St. Matthew is placed first because he begins his gospel with the promise, that is, by Abraham to whom the promise of the incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ was made. After him comes Saint Luke, because he tells the different circumstances of the incarnation. The third is St. Mark, who attests that the gospel preached by Jesus Christ was promised in the law. The fourth is St. John, who by this exordium: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," openly proclaims the divinity of him whose incarnation was promised to Abraham, as told by St. Luke, and of which St. Mark shows that the gospel was preached according to the prophet Isaiah's prediction.

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY OT & NT

**QUESTION 9. ON THE ETERNITY OF THE SON.** — There are some who have not yet dispelled the darkness of error, nor thoroughly purified the defilements of their past life, have ideas all earthly, and doubt the divinity of the Son of God, or believe that there is no distinction between the Father and the Son. I do not speak here of the faithless and stubborn Jews, to whom God has opened the source of the law and the treasures of the mysteries, for them they are guilty not only of doubt, but of sacrilegious denials. I will therefore explain this truth as much as the limits of a short treatise will permit me. Hope is left entirely to the ignorant who consent to learn, but those who refuse the light have only to wait for eternal punishment. The Almighty God, whose greatness and goodness have no equal, must have engendered and produced of himself a being of sovereign greatness and goodness.

If he had begotten a being who was opposed to his sovereign perfection, he would have given reason to think that he could not have done more and to find his power in default, or that he had not wanted it and to accuse his goodness. For Almighty God it was not a very great work to create a being who was inferior to him, would not possess a sovereign perfection. Above him there was nothing, for there is nothing superior to God; what could exist beneath him was little, for there can be no relation of convenience between the imperfect and the most perfectly perfect. In producing therefore a Son absolutely like him, he has begotten of himself, as another himself, and thus this supreme and sovereign good which comes to us from God, has come down to us because he begot. Another reason that must be considered is that God, who created this world, and among so many other wonders of order and beauty that he makes manifest in creation, has given to all creatures the faculty of reproducing beings of the same nature and of the same kind, must have possessed first the power which he has communicated; because no one can give what he does not have. God, therefore, who has begotten a Son who is absolutely and perfectly like him, that is to say, unique as he is unique, holy as he is holy, good as he is good, happy as he is happy, sovereign as he is Sovereign, eternal as he is eternal, wanted to possess the first fertility and thus give the creatures he had to draw from the void the example of reproducing according to his nature and his species. And in it, the order required that whoever was to be the Father of all things, should first be Father in the proper sense of the word, that is to say Father of a Son who was by nature. However, when we say that God begets a Son, it is not in this sense that his origin is like ours, and that it is born as mortal men who come out of the womb who are born to start an existence they did not have before. All other creatures owe to external causes and to the elements which surround them, to reproduce each one according to the species which is peculiar to it. The nature of God, on the contrary, without the union of any foreign cause, engendered and produced from his nature that which was in it and with it from all eternity. Thus, when we say that light is born of the sun, because it is produced by the sun that seems to engender it, we hear, not that the sun may have ever existed without its light and that it has engendered in a time subsequent to his own existence, but this light which has always been in him, which is like his production and his son, spreads without waiting the progress of time, and without any distinction from the fruitful principle of his shine and splendor. It is thus that the

Son of God, intimately united to God from all eternity, possesses this character of resemblance to God, of having neither beginning nor end. God is eternal and has no origin, the Son is also eternal. God is one, he is simple, he is immutable; so that the Son is so united to his Father, that, except the distinction of names and persons, the two are one and the same nature, and that their greatness and majesty are inseparable. God did not father his Son with the help of contrary elements; he has engendered him from the simple and unique source of his divine nature, he has always had him in his bosom, he has never been separated from him, and he is so closely united to him that the unity that exists between them cannot soften the slightest alteration.

## INDEX OF QUESTIONS

### 1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT

(PL 35 2214-2250)

1-47

**QUESTION 1.** WHAT IS GOD? (pg. 344)

**QUESTION 2.** WHY DID GOD CREATE THE WORLD? (pg. 12)

**QUESTION 3.** WHAT NEED WAS IT TO MAKE IT KNOWN BY MOSES THE BEGINNING OF THE WORLD AND THE ORDER OF CREATION, AND NOT BEFORE HIM? (pg. 16)

**QUESTION 4.** WHY DID NOT GOD GIVE THE LAW FROM THE BEGINNING? (pg. 347)

**QUESTION 5.** WHY WAS THE SACRIFICE OF ABEL APPROVED OF GOD, AND THAT OF CAIN REFUSED? (pg. 51)

**QUESTION 6.** DID LAMECH KILL CAIN, AS SOME THINK? (pg. 53)

**QUESTION 7.** WHAT ARE THE TEN WORDS THAT WERE WRITTEN ON THE TWO TABLES, OR WHAT WORDS WERE ENGRAVED ON EACH TABLE, AND WHAT WAS THEIR NUMBER? (pg. 90)

**QUESTION 8.** WHY DID MOSES, COMING DOWN FROM THE MOUNTAIN WITH THE TABLES OF THE LAW, HAVE A FACE SO BRIGHT THAT IT COULD NOT BE FIXED ON HIM? (pg. 95)

**QUESTION 9.** IF ALL THE CREATURES THAT GOD MADE WERE GOOD AND VERY GOOD, WHY DID HE SAY TO NOAH, "BRING WITH YOU

INTO THE ARK OF PURE AND UNCLEAN ANIMALS, SINCE NO ONE CAN CALL GOOD WHAT IS UNCLEAN?" (GEN. 1:31; 7:2) (pg. 28)

**QUESTION 10.** GOD HAVING FORETOLD TO ABRAHAM THAT THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL WOULD BE FREED FROM THE DOMINION OF THE EGYPTIANS. THE FOURTH GENERATION, WHY DOES THE LAW SAY, "THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL SHALL COME FORTH OUT OF THE LAND OF EGYPT INTO THE FIFTH GENERATION?" (pg. 77)

**QUESTION 11.** IF THE WILL OF THE RIGHTEOUS MAN IS GOOD, WHY DID NOT ISAAC BLESS ESAU AS HE WISHED, BUT JACOB WHOM HE WOULD NOT BLESS? (pg. 82)

**QUESTION 12.** WHY DID ABRAHAM RECEIVE CIRCUMCISION AS A SIGN OF HIS FAITH? (pg. 78)

**QUESTION 13.** IF GOD'S JUDGMENTS ARE RIGHT, WHY WERE THE CHILDREN CONSPIRED WITH THEIR PARENTS IN THE FIRE OF SODOM? (pg. 80)

**QUESTION 14.** WHY DOES GOD, WHOSE SCRIPTURE PRAISES JUSTICE, THREATEN TO PUNISH THE SINS OF PARENTS THROUGH THEIR CHILDREN UNTIL THE THIRD AND FOURTH GENERATIONS? (pg. 91)

**QUESTION 15.** SINCE THE LAW PRAISES THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE TRUE RIGHTEOUS IS THE ONE WHO DOES ALL RIGHTEOUSNESS, HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF SOLOMON: "DO NOT BE OVERLY RIGHTEOUS?" (pg. 143)

**QUESTION 16.** WHY DID THE ANGEL WHO WANTED TO KILL MOSES, IN THE ROUTE, BE APPEASED BY THE CIRCUMCISION OF HIS CHILD? (pg. 87)

**QUESTION 17.** WHY DOES THE LAW DECLARE AND ACCURSE THOSE WHO HAVE NOT LEFT POSTERITY IN ISRAEL, WHILE ISAIAH PROMISES THAT NOTHING IS TO BE FEARED FOR THE EUNUCHS WHO CANNOT HAVE CHILDREN? (pg. 94)

**QUESTION 18.** WHY DID SAUL AFTER HIS SIN, ASK THAT GOD BE PRAISED, FOR FORGIVENESS WITHOUT BEING ABLE TO OBTAIN IT, WHILE DAVID, ALSO A SINNER, ASKED FOR IT AND OBTAINED IT? (pg. 106)

**QUESTION 19.** WAS ADAM'S BODY, WHEN IT WAS CREATED, IMMORTAL OR SUBJECT TO DEATH? (pg. 51)

**QUESTION 20.** WHY DOES SCRIPTURE SAY, "MAN HAS EATEN THE BREAD OF ANGELS," SINCE ANGELS, CREATURES SIMPLE IN THEIR NATURE AND CLOTHED WITH A VERY SPIRITUAL POWER, DO NOT NEED FOOD? (pg. 139)

**QUESTION 21.** IN WHAT SENSE IS IT TO BE UNDERSTOOD THAT GOD MADE MAN IN HIS IMAGE AND LIKENESS, AND IS WOMAN ALSO THE IMAGE OF GOD? (pg. 26)

**QUESTION 22.** WHY DOES SOLOMON SAY, "JUSTIFY YOUR SOUL BEFORE YOUR DEATH," AS WE READ IN A PSALM, "NO LIVING MAN WILL BE JUSTIFIED IN YOUR PRESENCE?" (pg. 144)

**QUESTION 23.** DO SOULS COME BY WAY OF PROPAGATION LIKE BODIES? (pg. 28)

**QUESTION 24.** WHY, SINCE MAN AND WOMAN ARE ONE FLESH, IS MAN THE IMAGE OF GOD AND NOT WOMAN? (pg. 24)

**QUESTION 25.** WHY DID JOSEPH, AFTER PREDICTING THE FUTURE, BESEECH THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL TO CARRY HIS ASHES FROM EGYPT WHEN GOD DELIVERED THEM? (pg. 85)

**QUESTION 26.** DID ELISHA GET WHAT HE ASKED INDISCREETLY FOR ELIJAH? (pg. 110)

**QUESTION 27.** DID THE WITCH MENTIONED SAMUEL; DID HE REALLY APPEAR BEFORE HER, AND DID HE SAY TO SAUL THE WORDS WHICH THE BOOK OF KINGS RELATES? (pg. 108)

**QUESTION 28.** WHAT CAN WE SAY TO THOSE WHO CLAIM THAT THIS WORLD EXISTS NATURALLY FROM ALL ETERNITY, AND THAT IT HAS NEITHER BEGINNING NOR END? (pg. 15)

**QUESTION 29.** WHY DID GOD COMMAND THE CIRCUMCISION OF THE CHILDREN ON THE EIGHTH DAY? (pg. 80)

**QUESTION 30.** IT IS WRITTEN IN PROVERBS: "THE RIGHTEOUS ACCUSES HIMSELF FIRST FROM THE BEGINNING OF HIS SPEECH. HOW CAN HE BE RIGHT IF HE IS A SINNER? (pg. 140)

**QUESTION 31.** IS IT TRUE THAT IT WAS A SERPENT WHO SPOKE WITH THE WOMAN, OR IS IT THE VERY ACT OF THE DEVIL WHO HAS SEDUCED HER, WHO HAS GIVEN HER THE NAME OF SERPENT? (pg. 49)

**QUESTION 32.** WE READ IN THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON: "THE RICH AND THE POOR HAVE COME TOGETHER, THE LORD IS THE CREATOR OF BOTH." HOW THEN CAN ONE SAY THAT THERE IS NOT IN GOD THE ACCEPTATION OF PERSONS? (pg. 141)

**QUESTION 33.** SOLOMON SAYS THAT THE YEARS OF THE WICKED WILL BE SHORTENED; HOW DO WE SEE IMPIOUS PEOPLE IN GREAT NUMBERS PROLONGING THEIR LIVES ON EARTH? (pg. 140)

**QUESTION 34.** HOW DOES THE SAME SOLOMON SAYS ON ONE SIDE: "GOD DID NOT KILL," AND IN ANOTHER: "THE GOODS AND THE EVILS, THE LIFE AND THE DEATH, THE POVERTY AND THE LUXURY COME FROM GOD?" (pg. 144)

**QUESTION 35.** HOW CAN DAVID STILL CALL SAUL THE ANOINTED OF THE LORD, AND DO HIM HONOR IN THIS EXCELLENCE AFTER THE LORD HAD DEPARTED FROM HIM? (pg. 107)

**QUESTION 36.** IF THE SINNING SOUL ALONE IS TO BE PUNISHED BY THE DEAD, WHY IN THE SIN OF ACHAN, THE SON OF CHARMI, THIRTY MEN WERE SLAIN TO ATONE FOR HIS CRIME? (pg. 98)

**QUESTION 37.** WHY DID THE DEATH SENT AGAINST JACOB FALL ON ISRAEL, SINCE JACOB IS ALSO CALLED BY THE NAME OF ISRAEL? (pg. 149)

**QUESTION 38.** IF THE HORSE AND THE MULE HAVE NO INTELLIGENCE, HOW MUCH LESS THE EARTH, WHICH HAS NO FEELING? WHY IS THE EARTH INVITED TO BLESS THE LORD? (pg. 121)

**QUESTION 39.** WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF SOLOMON MEAN: "HOPE IS IN DARKNESS; A LIVING DOG IS BETTER THAN A DEAD LION?" (pg. 142)

**QUESTION 40.** WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF THE PROPHET MEAN: "REJOICE, STERILE WHO DOES NOT GET PREGNANT, SING HYMNS OF PRAISE, SHOUT FOR JOY, YOU WHO HAD NO CHILDREN, THE ABANDONED WIFE HAS BECOME MORE FERTILE THAN THE ONE WHO HAS A HUSBAND." (pg. 151)

**QUESTION 41.** WAS THE SPIRIT THAT WAS CARRIED ON THE WATERS THE HOLY SPIRIT, AS THESE WORDS WOULD SEEM TO INDICATE: "THE SPIRIT OF GOD WAS CARRIED ON THE WATERS?" (pg. 18)

**QUESTION 42.** WHY WAS THE ANGEL WHO WAS SENT TO SPEAK TO MOSES APPEARED TO HIM ON THE MOUNTAIN IN THE MIDST OF FIRE AND A BUSH? (pg. 86)

**QUESTION 43.** SINCE GOD FORBADE ABRAHAM TO SACRIFICE HIS SON, WHY DID HE NOT ALSO DEFEND JEPHTHAH FROM SACRIFICING HIS DAUGHTER? (pg. 99)

**QUESTION 44.** HOW CAN ONE PROVE BY THE TESTIMONY OF THE PROPHETS RECEIVED BY THE GENTILES UNDER THE NEW COVENANT THAT THE PROMISE THAT GOD MADE TO ABRAHAM WAS FULFILLED BY THE COMING OF CHRIST? (pg. 61)

**QUESTION 45.** HOW WAS MAN MADE IN THE IMAGE OF GOD, CREATED TO COMMAND, AND SO IS WOMAN? (pg. 25)

**QUESTION 46.** WAS SAMUEL ONE OF AARON'S CHILDREN, AND SHOULD IT BE ADMITTED THAT HE WAS A PRIEST? (pg. 101)

**QUESTION 47.** BY WHAT MEANS DO THESE WORDS OF ISAIAH: "SEVEN WOMEN WILL TAKE, ETC.," SHOULD THEY BE UNDERSTOOD AS THE SEVEN CATHOLIC CHURCHES? (pg. 146)

1<sup>ST</sup> CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

(PL 35 2250-2386)

48-127

**QUESTION 48.** GOD IS UNDOUBTEDLY SUPREMELY PERFECT AND INDEPENDENT OF ALL THINGS; WHAT WAS IT THEN THAT CHRIST THE SAVIOR WAS BORN OF GOD, AND THAT GOD HAD A SON BY WHOM HE DID ALL THINGS? (pg. 348)

**QUESTION 49.** WHY WAS THE SAVIOR, WHO WAS A SAINT FROM HIS BIRTH AND WHO RECEIVED THE NAME OF CHRIST THE LORD, BAPTIZED, SINCE BAPTISM WAS INSTITUTED TO PURIFY SIN? (pg. 164)

**QUESTION 50.** IF THE SAVIOR WANTED TO BE BAPTIZED TO SERVE AS AN EXAMPLE, WHY, ALTHOUGH HE HAD BEEN CIRCUMCISED, DID HE FORBID OTHERS TO DO SO? (pg. 165)

**QUESTION 51.** HOW MUST WE HEAR THE ANSWER GIVEN BY THE ANGEL GABRIEL TO THESE WORDS OF MARY: "HOW SHALL I KNOW WHAT YOU SAY TO ME, FOR I KNOW NO MAN? AND THE ANGEL GABRIEL ANSWERING SAID TO HIM, "THE HOLY GHOST WILL COME UPON YOU, AND THE VIRTUE OF THE MOST HIGH WILL OVERSHADOW YOU?" (pg. 205)

**QUESTION 52.** IF CHRIST WAS BORN OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, THAT IS TO SAY IF IT WAS BY HIS OPERATION THAT HE WAS MADE FLESH OF THE FLESH OF MARY, WHY IS IT WRITTEN: "WISDOM, WHICH IS CHRIST, BUILT A HOME?" (PROV. 9:1) (pg. 159)

**QUESTION 53.** IF GOD DOES ALL RIGHTLY, WHY IS IT SAID THAT THE SAVIOR WAS BORN THE EIGHTH OF THE CALENDAR OF JANUARY? (pg. 160)

**QUESTION 54.** IF JESUS CHRIST, OF THE RACE OF DAVID, BECAME THE SON OF GOD ACCORDING TO THE FLESH, THAT IS, IF IN HIS BIRTH HE WAS THE SON OF GOD IN HIS TWO NATURES BECAUSE HE WAS BORN HOLY, HOW CAN HE BE LORD GOD TOLD HIM AFTER HIS BAPTISM: "YOU ARE MY SON, I BEGOT YOU TODAY"? (HEBREWS 5:5; ACTS 13:33; PSALM 2:7) (pg. 167)

**QUESTION 55.** WHY DID THE LORD WANT TO BE CRUCIFIED ON THE EIGHTH DAY OF THE CALENDAR OF APRIL, THE TIME OF THE PASSOVER CELEBRATION FOR THE JEWS? (pg. 194)

**QUESTION 56.** WHY DID ST. MATTHEW WRITE THAT JACOB WAS JOSEPH'S FATHER, WHILE ST. LUKE GIVES HIM AS THE SON OF HELI, SO THAT HE IS NOT WISELY PRESENTED AS HAVING TWO FATHERS, OR DO NOT KNOW EXACTLY WHO HIS REAL FATHER IS? (pg. 155)

**QUESTION 57.** HOW CAN ST. MARK ATTRIBUTE TO THE PROPHET ISAIAH THOSE WORDS WHICH WE READ IN THE PROPHET MALACHI? "BEHOLD, I SEND MY ANGEL BEFORE YOUR FACE TO PREPARE THE WAY FOR YOU." (pg. 198)

**QUESTION 58.** FOR WHAT REASON CAN JOHN THE BAPTIST DENY THAT HE KNEW CHRIST BEFORE HIS BAPTISM, WHEN HE TOLD HIM WHEN HE APPROACHED HIM TO BE BAPTIZED: "IT IS I WHO MUST BE BAPTIZED BY YOU, AND YOU COME TO ME?" HOW DID HE NOT KNOW WHO HE FORBADE BAPTIZING BY HUMBLING HIMSELF DEEPLY BEFORE HIM? (pg. 172)

**QUESTION 59.** IF BAPTISM IS A HEAVENLY MYSTERY, WHY DOES OUR LORD SAY TO NICODEMUS, WHO DOUBTED THE VIRTUE OF THE BAPTISM OF WHICH HE SPOKE TO HIM: IF I HAVE TOLD YOU EARTHLY THINGS AND YOU DO NOT BELIEVE THEM, HOW SHALL I BELIEVE? WHAT IF I TELL YOU HEAVENLY THINGS? (pg. 230)

**QUESTION 60.** IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE ONLY IN EFFECT UNTIL JOHN THE BAPTIST, HOW DOES THE SAVIOR SEND LEPROSERS TO OFFER GIFTS TO PRIESTS FOR THE HEALING OF THEIR LEPROSY? (pg. 179)

**QUESTION 61.** WHY DID THE SAVIOR, RESPONDING TO THE JEWS WHO ACCUSED THE DISCIPLES OF BREAKING THE SABBATH BY CRUSHING EARS OF CORN IN THEIR HANDS TO EAT THEM, BRING THEM THE EXAMPLE OF DAVID, WHO HAD EATEN BREADS THAT WERE PERMITTED TO BE SLAUGHTERED? ONLY TO THE PRIESTS, AN EXAMPLE WHICH, FAR FROM JUSTIFYING THEM, MAKES THEM GUILTY OF THE SAME FAULT AS DAVID, WHO, MOREOVER, DID NOT DO THIS ACTION ON A SABBATH DAY (1 SAM. 21:4). (pg. 184)

**QUESTION 62.** WHY DOES IT SAY THAT RACHEL IS MOURNING HER CHILDREN WHEN IT WAS LIA'S CHILDREN WHO HAD BEEN PUT TO DEATH? (pg. 163)

**QUESTION 63.** HOW COULD THE MAGI OF CHALDEA LEARN THE BIRTH OF CHRIST, KING OF THE JEWS, ON THE APPEARANCE OF A STAR THAT IS MORE COMMONLY THE SIGN THAT ANNOUNCES A KING OF THE EARTH? (pg. 161)

**QUESTION 64.** HOW CAN ONE PROVE THAT THE SAVIOR ROSE FROM THE DEAD AFTER THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS? (pg. 195)

**QUESTION 65.** IF THE EVANGELISTS HAD THE SAME THOUGHT, THE SAME LANGUAGE, HOW IS IT THAT WHEN THREE OF THEM, ST. MATTHEW, ST. LUKE AND ST. JOHN, SAY THAT THE SAVIOR WAS

CRUCIFIED IN THE SIXTH HOUR, ST. MARK, ON THE CONTRARY, REPORTS THAT HE WAS AT THE THIRD HOUR? (pg. 191)

**QUESTION 66.** HOW DID THE EVANGELIST ST. MARK SAY THAT THE DEMONS KNEW JESUS AND CONFESSED HIM PUBLICLY, WHILE THE APOSTLE DECLARES THAT THE PRINCES AND POWERS OF THIS WORLD HAVE NOT KNOWN THE DIVINITY OF THE LORD JESUS? (1 COR. 2:8) (pg. 198)

**QUESTION 67.** HOW TO EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF THE SAVIOR ON THE CROSS: "MY FATHER, FORGIVE THEM, FOR THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY DO?" (pg. 218)

**QUESTION 68.** OUR LORD COMMANDS US TO PRAY FOR OUR ENEMIES, HOW THEN TO EXPLAIN THIS PLACE OF REVELATION, WHERE THE SOULS OF THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN KILLED ASK GOD TO AVENGE THEM? (REV. 6:10) (pg. 177)

**QUESTION 69.** IF THE LAW HAS CEASED TO BE OBLIGATORY TO THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST OR THE SAVIOR, HOW CAN WE EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF OUR LORD: "I DID NOT COME TO DESTROY THE LAW OR THE PROPHETS, BUT TO FULFILL IT?" IF IT WERE FORBIDDEN TO OBSERVE IT, WAS IT NOT DESTROYED BY LOSING THE AUTHORITY IT HAD OVER THE CONDUCT OF MEN? (pg. 173)

**QUESTION 70.** OUR LORD CERTAINLY COMMANDS US TO BE ENEMIES OF THE DEVIL; WHY, THEN, DOES HE TELL US IN THE GOSPEL: "DO YOU FIGHT TO BE RECONCILED WITH YOUR ADVERSARY?" WHO IS THE MAN'S ADVERSARY, IF NOT THE DEVIL? (pg. 176)

**QUESTION 71.** JACOB WAS CALLED THE MAN WHO SEES GOD (GEN. 32:30), AND MOSES SAW GOD FACE TO FACE. (EXOD. 33:11) THE LORD ALSO SAYS, "I SAW WITH MY OWN EYES THE GOD OF ARMIES." (ISAIAH 6:5) ON THE CONTRARY, THE EVANGELIST ST. JOHN SAYS:

"NO MAN HAS EVER SEEN GOD. (1 JN. 4:12) SO HERE THERE IS A CONTRADICTION. (pg. 83)

**QUESTION 72.** WHEN WE READ IN REVELATION, "GO AND TAKE THE OPEN BOOK OUT OF THE HAND OF THE ANGEL AND DEVOUR IT, AND IT WILL BE BITTER IN YOUR BOWELS, BUT IN YOUR MOUTH IT WILL BE SWEET AS HONEY." WHAT IS THIS BOOK THAT IS SWEET AND BITTER IN THE BOWELS? (pg. 305)

**QUESTION 73.** WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF SIMEON MEAN TO MARY, MOTHER OF OUR LORD: "THIS IS ESTABLISHED FOR THE RUIN AND FOR THE RESURRECTION OF MANY IN ISRAEL.... AND THE SWORD WILL PIERCE YOUR SOUL SO THAT THE THOUGHTS HIDDEN IN THE BOTTOM HEARTS OF MANY ARE REVEALED?" (pg. 208)

**QUESTION 74.** HOW TO RECONCILE THESE WORDS OF THE PROPHET ISAIAH SPEAKING OF CHRIST: "HE DID NOT COMMIT SIN," (ISAIAH 53:9) WITH THESE OTHERS OF THE APOSTLE: "HE WAS MADE SIN FOR US WHO KNEW NO SIN?" (2 COR. 5:21) (pg. 282)

**QUESTION 75.** WHY DOES THE LORD ONLY PAY THE DIDRACHM FOR HIMSELF AND PETER, AND NOT FOR THE OTHER APOSTLES? SINCE ALL HAD ABANDONED THEIR PROPERTY TO FOLLOW HIM, WAS HE NOT TO PAY THIS TRIBUTE FOR ALL? (pg. 187)

**QUESTION 76.** ST. JOHN SAYS IN HIS GOSPEL: "THE LAW WAS GIVEN BY MOSES; GRACE AND TRUTH CAME FROM JESUS CHRIST." SO GRACE AND TRUTH DID NOT EXIST BEFOREHAND. HOW, THEN, DID GOD GIVE A LAW THAT DID NOT CONTAIN THE TRUTH? (pg. 227)

**QUESTION 77.** WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF ST. MARK THE EVANGELIST MEAN ABOUT OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST: "HAVING ENTERED A HOUSE, HE DESIRED THAT NO ONE SHOULD KNOW IT, BUT HE COULD NOT REMAIN HIDDEN?" WANTED TO REMAIN HIDDEN AND THAT HE COULD NOT; WAS HIS WILL MADE POWERLESS? (pg. 201)

**QUESTION 78.** WE READ IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN THAT THE SAVIOR, AFTER SAYING THAT HE WOULD NOT GO TO JERUSALEM FOR THE FEAST DAY, WENT THERE SECRETLY, HOWEVER. IS NOT THIS AN ACT OF INCONSTANCY? (pg. 237)

**QUESTION 79.** IF WE ARE THE MASTERS OF OUR WILL, WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "NO ONE COMES TO ME UNLESS MY FATHER, WHO SENT ME, DRAWS HIM?" THE APOSTLE EXPRESSES HIMSELF IN SIMILAR TERMS: "IT IS NOT ENOUGH TO WANT OR TO RUN, GOD MUST HAVE MERCY"; AND AGAIN: "HE HAS MERCY ON WHOM HE PLEASES, AND HE LETS HIM HARDEN WHOM HE PLEASES." HOW DOES THE WILL REMAIN FREE IF IT IS TRAINED FOR GOOD OR EVIL, ACCORDING TO A FOREIGN WILL? (pg. 235)

**QUESTION 80.** EVERYONE IS NECESSARILY THE SON OF GOD OR THE SON OF THE DEVIL, HE IS THEREFORE ALWAYS SONS, SOMETIMES OF GOD, SOMETIMES OF THE DEVIL; WHY THEN IS IT COMMANDED US TO TAKE A SECOND BIRTH? (pg. 246)

**QUESTION 81.** THE APOSTLE, SAYS, "WE ARE THE JEWS OF OUR BIRTH," WANTS TO SHOW THAT THE JEWS DERIVE THEIR BIRTH FROM THE JEWS, AND I DO NOT SPEAK HERE OF THE PROSELYTES WHO BECOME JEWS. SO THOSE BORN IN THE DESERT WERE NOT CIRCUMCISED, YET THEY WERE JEWS. IT IS NOT CIRCUMCISION THAT MAKES THE JEW, BUT THE BIRTH OF PARENTS FAITHFUL TO THE RELIGION OF A CREATOR GOD. IF, THEN, JEWS ARE BORN OF THE JEWS, WHY ARE NOT CHRISTIANS ALSO BORN OF CHRISTIANS, JUST AS PAGANS ARE BORN PAGANS? (pg. 288)

**QUESTION 82.** NO DOUBT THE PAGANS WERE SUBJECT TO THE ELEMENTS OF THE WORLD. WHY THEN DOES THE APOSTLE SAY, "WE OURSELVES WERE ENSLAVED UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD." IF THE JEWS WERE THEMSELVES ENSLAVED TO THE ELEMENTS, HOW WERE THE PAGANS DIFFERENT? (pg. 294)

**QUESTION 83.** IF IT IS THROUGH JESUS CHRIST THAT WE HAVE SALVATION, THE TRUE AND PERFECT KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, WHY DID NOT HE COME SOONER SO THAT OUR FATHERS WHO WERE IN IGNORANCE SHOULD LEARN THE TRUTH? SINCE THE ADVENT OF CHRIST, MEN HAVE BEEN SAVED IN FAR GREATER NUMBERS THAN BEFORE. IF, THEREFORE, HE HAD COME EARLIER, THE NUMBER OF THE ELECT WOULD HAVE BEEN MUCH GREATER. IT IS THEREFORE REPREHENSIBLE NOT TO HAVE DONE SO. (pg. 349)

**QUESTION 84.** WHY DO WE, WHO ARE KEEPING THE PASSOVER FEAST BY THE PHASE OF THE MOON, REPROACH THE PAGANS FOR OBSERVING THE DAYS AND THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF THE MOON? (pg. 214)

**QUESTION 85.** IT IS CERTAIN THAT FROM DAVID UNTIL THE TRANSMIGRATION OF BABYLON, THERE ARE SEVENTEEN GENERATIONS; WHY, THEN, DOES THE EVANGELIST COUNT FOURTEEN, PUTTING OCHOSIAS WHO AFTER JEHORAM IS THE SON OF JEHOSHAPHAT, AS WELL AS JOASH OF OCHOSIAS AND AMASIAS SON OF JOASH? (pg. 159)

**QUESTION 86.** WHAT IS THE PROOF THAT MARY, MOTHER OF THE LORD, WAS OF THE TRIBE AND RACE OF DAVID? (pg. 204)

**QUESTION 87.** IF THERE IS ONLY ONE GOD, WHY PUT IN THREE THE HOPE OF SALVATION, RATHER THAN IN TWO, IN FOUR OR IN ONE; WHY IN THE END HAS THE MYSTERY OF THE TRINITY NOT BEEN PREACHED FROM THE BEGINNING? (pg. 354)

**QUESTION 88.** IF GRACE WAS MORE ABUNDANT AND INTELLIGENCE CLEARER UNDER THE NEW TESTAMENT THAN IN THE OLD, WHY DID THE PROPHET ISAIAH SEE ON THE THRONE OF HIS MAJESTY THE GOD OF ARMIES WHICH IS THE CHRIST, ACCORDING TO THE EXPLANATION OF THE EVANGELIST ST. JOHN WHO SAID: "ISAIAH PROPHESIED THUS WHEN HE SAW HIS GLORY AND SPOKE OF HIM; WHILE UNDER THE NEW TESTAMENT, STEPHEN, THE FIRST OF THE

MARTYRS, CLAIMS TO HAVE SEEN JESUS SITTING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD? (ACTS 7:55) HOW IS IT THAT ON ONE SIDE CHRIST APPEARS IN A SECONDARY RANK AFTER HIS TRIUMPHS, AND ON THE OTHER AS THE SOVEREIGN GOD, BEFORE HE HAS WON? (pg. 250)

**QUESTION 89.** THE SAVIOR SAYS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, THAT WHEN HE COMES HE WILL CONVICT THE WORLD CONCERNING SIN, AND RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND JUDGMENT; SIN, BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT BELIEVED IN ME; JUSTICE, BECAUSE I GO TO MY FATHER, AND YOU WILL SEE ME NO MORE; AND JUDGMENT, BECAUSE THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD IS ALREADY JUDGED. OUR LORD MAKES AN ACCUSATION AGAINST THE WORLD HERE, BUT NEEDS EXPLANATION. (pg. 264)

**QUESTION 90.** IF THE DEVIL IS SATAN HIMSELF, WHY DOES OUR LORD SAY TO THE JEWS, "THE FATHER OF WHOM YOU ARE BORN IS THE DEVIL, AND YOU WANT TO FULFILL THE DESIRES OF YOUR FATHER. HE WAS MURDERER FROM THE BEGINNING, AND HE DID NOT REMAIN IN THE TRUTH, FOR THE TRUTH IS NOT IN HIM. WHEN HE UTTERS A LIE, HE SAYS IT IS HIS OWN, FOR HE IS A LIAR LIKE HIS FATHER." (pg. 245)

**QUESTION 91.** HOW CAN WE FIGHT PHOTIN'S ARGUMENTS, WHO CLAIMS THAT CHRIST IS NOT OLDER THAN MARY? (pg. 356)

**QUESTION 92.** HOW SHOULD WE UNDERSTAND THESE WORDS OF THE SAVIOR: "I GIVE YOU MY PEACE, I LEAVE YOU MY PEACE, I DO NOT GIVE IT TO YOU AS THE WORLD GIVES IT?" (pg. 263)

**QUESTION 93.** WE MUST CONSIDER WHETHER THE APOSTLES HAD THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE TIME THEY WERE ON THE EARTH WITH THE LORD, FOR THE EVANGELIST SAYS: "THE HOLY SPIRIT HAD NOT YET BEEN GIVEN, BECAUSE JESUS CHRIST WAS NOT YET GLORIFIED." AND IN ANOTHER PLACE: "IF YOU LOVE ME," SAID JESUS TO HIS DISCIPLES, "KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS. AND I WILL PRAY THE FATHER, AND HE WILL GIVE YOU ANOTHER COUNSELOR, TO BE

WITH YOU FOREVER, EVEN THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, WHOM THE WORLD CANNOT RECEIVE, BECAUSE IT NEITHER SEES HIM NOR KNOWS HIM; YOU KNOW HIM, FOR HE DWELLS WITH YOU, AND WILL BE IN YOU." WHAT DO THESE WORDS MEAN? THE EVANGELIST DENIES THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT WAS GIVEN BEFORE PASSION, AND JESUS PROMISES TO PRAY TO HIS FATHER TO SEND HIM; AND ON THE OTHER HE ADDS THAT THIS SPIRIT WAS WITH THEM AND DWELT IN THEM. WE READ THAT AFTER HIS RESURRECTION HE BLEW ON THE APOSTLES AND SAID TO THEM, "RECEIVE THE HOLY SPIRIT." THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES TELL US AGAIN THAT HE CAME DOWN ON THE APOSTLES ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST. I SEE SO MANY CONTRADICTIONS IN THESE DIFFERENT ASSERTIONS THAT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT TO DO WITH THEM. (pg. 238)

**QUESTION 94.** DID JUDAS ISCARIOT, WHO BETRAYED OUR LORD, HANG HIMSELF BEFORE THE SAVIOR'S PASSION? (pg. 190)

**QUESTION 95.** WHAT WAS THE ORIGIN OF THE FEAST OF PENTECOST AND THE REASON FOR ITS INSTITUTION? (pg. 268)

**QUESTION 96.** SHOULD WE INTERPRET THE WORD PASSOVER IN THE SENSE OF THE PASSING OVER, AS THE GREEKS EXPLAIN? (pg. 276)

**QUESTION 97.** WHAT REASONABLE ANSWER CAN ONE MAKE FROM THE LAW TO THE IMPIETY OF ARIUS? (pg. 250)

**QUESTION 98.** ON THE GOSPEL OF SAINT JOHN. (pg. 243)

**QUESTION 99.** WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF THE APOSTLE MEAN: "LET ONLY HUMAN TEMPTATIONS COME TO YOU?" (pg. 279)

**QUESTION 100.** ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW. (pg. 182)

**QUESTION 101.** ON THE BOASTFULNESS OF ROMAN DEACONS. (pg. 362)

**QUESTION 102.** AGAINST NOVATIAN. (pg. 310)

**QUESTION 103.** HOW DOES THE LORD COMMIT IN LEVITICUS TO OFFER SACRIFICES AND LIBATIONS THAT HE REJECTS IN ANOTHER PLACE? WE READ IN LEVITICUS THAT THE LORD COMMANDED THE ISRAELITES TO OFFER HIM LIBATIONS, SACRIFICES, BURNT OFFERINGS. HOWEVER, THIS IS WHAT HE SAYS TO THEM THROUGH THE MOUTH OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH: "ADD AS MUCH AS YOU PLEASE YOUR BURNT OFFERINGS TO YOUR VICTIMS, AND EAT THE FLESH OF YOUR SACRIFICES, FOR I DID NOT ORDAIN TO YOUR FATHERS, IN THE DAY THAT I TOOK THEM OUT OF EGYPT, TO OFFER ME BURNT OFFERINGS AND VICTIMS." (pg. 96)

**QUESTION 104.** ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE. (pg. 216)

**QUESTION 105.** HOW TO RECONCILE THE PROPHECIES WITH THE GOSPEL ON THE OBSCURATION OF THE SUN AND ON SOME OTHER POINTS? (pg. 211)

**QUESTION 106.** ON GENESIS. (pg. 5)

**QUESTION 107.** SUCCESSION OF THE DAY AND NIGHT. (pg. 20)

**QUESTION 108.** OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE, WHERE DOES ITS NAME COME FROM. (pg. 55)

**QUESTION 109.** ON MELCHIZEDEK. (pg. 68)

**QUESTION 110.** ON THE FIRST PSALM. (pg. 117)

**QUESTION 111.** ON PSALM 23. (pg. 124)

**QUESTION 112.** ON PSALM FIFTY. (pg. 131)

**QUESTION 113.** WHY WAS THE SON OF GOD SENT, AND NOT ANOTHER? (pg. 366)

**QUESTION 114.** AGAINST THE PAGANS. (pg. 326)

**QUESTION 115.** CONCERNING DESTINY. (pg. 369)

**QUESTION 116.** THE REASON FOR THE PASSOVER. (pg. 89)

**QUESTION 117.** ON ABRAHAM. (pg. 59)

**QUESTION 118.** ON JOB. (pg. 114)

**QUESTION 119.** ON TOBIT. (pg. 112)

**QUESTION 120.** ON FASTING. (pg. 390)

**QUESTION 121.** PRAISE AND GLORY OF THE PASSOVER. (pg. 391)

**QUESTION 122.** THE PRINCIPLE OR THE BEGINNING. (pg. 220)

**QUESTION 123.** DID ADAM HAVE THE HOLY SPIRIT? (pg. 30)

**QUESTION 124.** THE SAME WORK FOLLOWING PEOPLE MAY BE DIFFERENT AND WORTHY OF PRAISE OR CONDEMNATION. (pg. 392)

**QUESTION 125.** AGAINST EUSEBIUS. (pg. 336)

**QUESTION 126.** FROM THE ONE WHO RECEIVED THE FAITH OF JESUS CHRIST. (pg. 394)

**QUESTION 127.** THE SIN OF ADAM AND EVE. (pg. 37)

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT

(PL 35 2386-92)

1-20

**QUESTION 1.** AGAINST THOSE WHO DENY THAT GOD IS INTERESTED IN THE ACTIONS OF MEN. (pg. 341)

**QUESTION 2.** THE SPIRIT WHO WAS CARRIED ON THE WATERS, MUST HE BE TAKEN FOR THE HOLY SPIRIT, BECAUSE IT IS WRITTEN, "THE SPIRIT OF GOD WAS CARRIED ON THE WATERS?" (pg. 18)

**QUESTION 3.** CAN IT BE SAID THAT ADAM RECEIVED THE HOLY SPIRIT AFTER GOD HAD GIVEN HIM BEING AND LIFE, BECAUSE IT IS WRITTEN, "GOD BREATHED ON HIS FACE A BREATH OF LIFE?" (pg. 35)

**QUESTION 4.** WHY DID GOD IMPOSE UPON ADAM THAT HE HAD PLACED IN THE WORLD A COMMANDMENT, A LAW, AFTER HAVING GIVEN HIM DOMINION OVER ALL CREATURES? (pg. 37)

**QUESTION 5.** WHY DOES GOD EXPRESS HIMSELF IN THIS WAY: "MY SPIRIT WILL NOT REMAIN IN MEN, BECAUSE THEY ARE FLESH, AND THEIR DAYS WILL BE BUT A HUNDRED AND TWENTY YEARS." (pg. 54)

**QUESTION 6.** WHAT IS THE BLESSING THAT JACOB GAVE TO HIS CHILDREN? (pg. 84)

**QUESTION 7.** OT WHY DID THE ANGEL WHO WAS SENT TO SPEAK TO MOSES APPEAR TO HIM IN THE MIDST OF A BUSH OF FIRE? (pg. 86)

**QUESTION 8.** DID NOT MOSES DO ANOTHER MIRACLE BEFORE PHARAOH THAN THAT OF THE ROD TURNED INTO A SERPENT? (pg. 88)

**QUESTION 9.** IF THERE IS ONE GOD, WHY MAKE THE HOPE OF SALVATION DEPENDENT ON THREE, NOT ON TWO OR FOUR, OR RATHER ONE? AND WHY WAS IT NOT PREACHED RATHER THE MYSTERY OF THE TRINITY? (pg. 354)

**QUESTION 10.** WHY DID GOD IMPOSE ON THE JEWISH PEOPLE CIRCUMCISION AND OTHER PRECEPTS THAT DID NOT EXIST BEFORE AND HAVE LOST ALL AUTHORITY NOW? (pg. 79)

**QUESTION 11.** IF IT IS IN PUNISHMENT FOR THEIR UNBELIEF AND THEIR MURMURINGS THAT THE JEWS HAVE RECEIVED HARSHER

COMMANDMENTS, WHAT HAVE THEIR CHILDREN DONE WRONG TO BE BOUND THEMSELVES TO THE OBSERVANCE OF THESE PRECEPTS? (pg. 399)

**QUESTION 12.** WHY IN THE LAW IS AARON HIMSELF COMMANDED TO OFFER BURNT OFFERINGS FOR HIS SINS, WHILE DAVID SAYS, "YOU DID NOT ASK FOR A BURNT OFFERING FOR SIN," (PS. 39) AND IN ANOTHER PSALM: "THE BURNT OFFERINGS ARE NOT PLEASING TO YOU." (PS. 50) WHY DOES HE COMMAND TO OFFER THEM TO THEM, IF THEY ARE NOT PLEASING TO HIM? (pg. 129)

**QUESTION 13.** WHY DID THE DEATH SENT AGAINST JACOB FALL ON ISRAEL, SINCE JACOB IS NONE OTHER THAN ISRAEL? (pg. 149)

**QUESTION 14.** IF THE SINNER ALONE SHOULD DIE IN PUNISHMENT FOR HIS SIN, WHY ARE THIRTY MEN PUT TO DEATH FOR THE PERSONAL SIN OF CHARMI? (pg. 98)

**QUESTION 15.** WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF THE PROPHET MEAN: "REJOICE, STERILE WHO DOES NOT GET PREGNANT, SING HYMNS OF PRAISE, SHOUT FOR JOY, YOU WHO HAD NO CHILDREN, THE ABANDONED WIFE HAS BECOME MORE FERTILE THAN THE ONE WHO HAS A HUSBAND." (pg. 151)

**QUESTION 16.** MAY THE EARTH BLESS THE LORD, THAT IS TO SAY, LET IT PRAISE AND CELEBRATE ITS POWER; HOW THEN DO YOU EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF THE PSALMIST: WILL THE DUST PRAISE YOU, WILL IT ANNOUNCE YOUR TRUTH? (pg. 121)

**QUESTION 17.** "HE HAS PLACED," SAYS THE PSALMIST, "HIS TENT IN THE SUN," THAT IS TO SAY, HIS BODY IN WHICH JESUS CHRIST DWELT, AND WHICH WAS DELIVERED BY PILATE TO THE TORTURE OF BURNING; HOW THEN IS IT SAID IN ANOTHER PSALM WHICH HAS THE OBJECT OF CHRIST: "THE FLOGGING SHALL NOT COME NEAR TO YOUR TABERNACLE," (Ps. 40) (pg. 123)

**QUESTION 18.** WHY IS SOLOMON IN THE SPIRIT OF WISDOM, ALTHOUGH HIS MANNERS WERE FAR FROM PURE, SINCE HE WAS DOMINATED BY THE UNREGULATED LOVE OF WOMEN? (pg. 110)

**QUESTION 19.** IT IS WRITTEN IN ONE OF SOLOMON'S BOOKS: "HOPE IS IN DARKNESS, AND A LIVING DOG IS BETTER THAN A DEAD LION." (pg. 142)

**QUESTION 20.** WE READ IN THE BOOK OF WISDOM: "GOD CREATED THE WORLD OF INVISIBLE MATTER," AND THESE VERY CONTRARY WORDS THAT WE WERE CREATED FROM NOTHING. (pg. 145)

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

(PL 35 2392-2412)

1-65

**QUESTION 1.** WHY WERE THE ACTIONS AND WORDS OF THE LORD WRITTEN BY FOUR DIFFERENT AUTHORS? (pg. 399)

**QUESTION 2.** SINCE IT IS CERTAIN THAT WE HAVE FOUR AUTHENTIC BOOKS OF THE FACTS AND WORDS OF OUR LORD, IN WHAT ORDER SHOULD WE PLACE THEM? (pg. 400)

**QUESTION 3.** WHY DOES ST. MATTHEW, WRITING THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST, BEGIN LIKE THIS: "THE BOOK OF THE GENERATION OF JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF DAVID," SINCE ABRAHAM IS BEFORE DAVID? (pg. 153)

**QUESTION 4.** WHY DOES THE APOSTLE ST. MATTHEW DIVIDE ALL GENERATIONS INTO THREE SETS? (pg. 153)

**QUESTION 5.** WHY DID THE EVANGELIST SAY THERE ARE ONLY FORTY-ONE GENERATIONS WHEN THERE ARE FORTY-TWO, BECAUSE THREE TIMES FOURTEEN ARE FORTY-TWO? (pg. 154)

**QUESTION 6.** WHY DOES ST. MATTHEW GIVE JOSEPH JACOB AS FATHER, WHILE ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE IT WOULD BE HELI, SO MUCH SO THAT JOSEPH IS REPRESENTED TO US WITH RATHER LITTLE SKILL AS HAVING TWO FATHERS OR A MAN WHOSE TRUE FATHER WE DO NOT KNOW? (pg. 155)

**QUESTION 7.** IT IS CERTAIN THAT THE SAVIOR WAS CALLED FROM HIS BIRTH SON OF GOD AND CHRIST; FOR WHAT THEN DOES THE TEMPTER COME TO HIM AFTER HIS BAPTISM, SAYING TO HIM, "IF YOU ARE THE SON OF GOD, ETC." (pg. 169)

**QUESTION 8.** WHY DOES THE SAVIOR RESIST THE TEMPTATIONS OF THE DEVIL ONLY BY SPEAKING TO HIM OF THE WORDS OF THE LAW? (pg. 169)

**QUESTION 9.** IF THERE IS ONE GOD, WHY MAKE THE HOPE OF SALVATION DEPENDENT ON THREE, NOT ON TWO OR FOUR, OR RATHER ONE? AND WHY WAS IT NOT PREACHED RATHER THE MYSTERY OF THE TRINITY? (pg. 354)

**QUESTION 10.** HOW IS IT THAT JOHN THE BAPTIST, WHO HAD FIRST BORNE WITNESS TO THE SAVIOR, THEN CONCEIVED OF DOUBTS BY ASKING HIM BY HIS DISCIPLES: ARE YOU THE ONE TO COME, OR SHOULD WE EXPECT ANOTHER? (pg. 171)

**QUESTION 11.** HOW IS IT THAT WE READ ABOVE THAT HEROD WAS DEAD, AND LOWER DOWN, SEVERAL YEARS LATER HE PUT JOHN THE BAPTIST TO DEATH; WHILE IT IS SAID ABOVE THAT JOHN SURVIVED HEROD'S DEATH? (pg. 162)

**QUESTION 12.** THE LORD HAS TAUGHT US TO PRAY FOR OUR ENEMIES, SO WHY DO THE SOULS OF THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN

KILLED ASK TO BE AVENGED AND IMPORE THIS VENGEANCE OF THE LORD? (REV. 6:10) (pg. 177)

**QUESTION 13.** IF THE LAW HAD TO STOP AT THE PREACHING OF THE SAVIOR OR OF JOHN THE BAPTIST, HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THESE WORDS OF THE SAVIOR: I DID NOT COME TO DESTROY THE LAW OR THE PROPHETS, BUT TO FULFILL THEM? IF THE LAW CEASED TO EXIST, HOW WAS IT NOT DESTROYED, SINCE IT LOST ITS STRENGTH AND AUTHORITY? (pg. 173)

**QUESTION 14.** JOHN ASKS THE LORD: ARE YOU THE ONE TO COME, OR SHOULD WE EXPECT ANOTHER? (pg. 181)

**QUESTION 15.** WHY DID THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS LAST UNTIL JOHN, AND THEN CEASE TO EXIST? BECAUSE THE ONE THEY ANNOUNCED HAD ARRIVED. BUT WHY DID THE LAW ONLY LAST UNTIL JOHN, SINCE THE APOSTLE TEACHES US THAT WE MUST BE SUBJECT TO THE LAW; FOR ALL THAT IS, SAYS HE, IS ESTABLISHED OF GOD? (pg. 181)

**QUESTION 16.** THE SAVIOR SAYS THAT JOHN'S BAPTISM CAME FROM HEAVEN, SO WHY DO YOU SAY NICODEMUS'S BAPTISM TO HIM? (pg. 230)

**QUESTION 17.** WHY DOES THE SAVIOR BEGIN TO REFUSE TO HAVE COMPASSION ON A FOREIGN WOMAN, THAT IS, THE CANANEAN (MATT.15), WHILE GRANTING THE BLESSING OF SALVATION TO THE CENTURION WHO WAS A STRANGER AND TO THE LEPER WHOM HE DECLARES HIMSELF NOT TO BE OF THE PEOPLE OF GOD? (LUKE 7; 17) (pg. 186)

**QUESTION 18.** HOW CAN ONE PROVE THE TRUTH OF THESE WORDS OF THE SAVIOR, THAT HE WOULD RISE FROM THE DEAD AFTER THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS, SINCE AFTER SUFFERING THE TORMENTS OF HIS PASSION ON THE DAY OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, HE RESURRECTED FIRST LIGHT OF SUNDAY WHEN DARKNESS STILL

COVERED THE EARTH? THE NUMBER OF DAYS AND NIGHTS DOES NOT SEEM TO FIT. (pg. 195)

**QUESTION 19.** WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "PRAY THAT YOUR FLIGHT WILL NOT COME IN WINTER OR ON THE SABBATH"; SINCE THE TIME OF THIS PERSECUTION CANNOT BE DIVIDED, ACCORDING TO THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTLE: "THE MAN OF SIN, THE SON OF PERDITION," HE SAYS, "WILL BE REVEALED IN HIS DAY"; (2 THESS. 2:3) AND HE SAYS AGAIN IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES: "DETERMINING THE TIMES OF THE DURATION OF PEOPLES AND THE LIMITS OF THEIR ABODE?" (ACTS 17) WHY, THEN, DOES THE SAVIOR LET US UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS NOT GOOD TO FLEE IN THE WINTER OR ON THE SABBATH? (pg. 189)

**QUESTION 20.** WHEN THE SAVIOR FORETOLD HIS PASSION AND RESURRECTION THREE DAYS AFTER HIS DEATH, HE ADDED, "AFTER I AM RISEN, I WILL GO BEFORE YOU TO GALILEE, WHERE YOU WILL SEE ME." THE ANGEL HOLDS THE SAME LANGUAGE TO THE HOLY WOMEN, AND YET HE WAS SEEN IN JERUSALEM BY THE DISCIPLES AND BY THE HOLY WOMEN THEMSELVES. (pg. 190)

**QUESTION 21.** SENTENCE IS PRONOUNCED. BUT IT SEEMS CERTAIN THAT IT WAS BETWEEN THE FIFTH AND SIXTH HOURS THAT PILATE SAT DOWN ON HIS TRIBUNAL, AND PRONOUNCED SENTENCE, AS ST. JOHN TELLS IT. (pg. 191)

**QUESTION 22.** IF THE SAVIOR WAS BAPTIZED TO GIVE US AN EXAMPLE, WHY DOES HE FORBID OTHERS TO BE CIRCUMCISED AS HE WAS? (pg. 165)

**QUESTION 23.** BECAUSE THE JEWS ACCUSED THE DISCIPLES OF TRANSGRESSING THE LAW BY TEARING OFF THE EARS OF THE SABBATH, THE SAVIOR BROUGHT THE EXAMPLE OF DAVID SAYING TO THEM, DO YOU NOT KNOW WHAT DAVID DID WHEN HE WAS HUNGRY, HOW HE TOOK THE BREAD OF PROPOSAL, ATE IT, AND GAVE IT TO THOSE WHO WERE WITH HIM, WHICH WAS PERMITTED

ONLY TO THE PRIESTS ALONE? HOWEVER, THIS EXAMPLE DOES NOT SEEM TO EXCUSE THE DISCIPLES, WHO CAN BE PREVARICATORS OF THE LAW AS WELL AS DAVID WAS. (pg. 184)

**QUESTION 24.** WHY DID THE SAVIOR CALL HIS DISCIPLES THE SONS OF THUNDER, WHO WERE RATHER THE SONS OF GOD, FOR THUNDER IS PRODUCED BY THE CLASH OF CLOUDS BETWEEN THEM? (pg. 201)

**QUESTION 25.** HOW TO EXPLAIN THE STORY OF THE EVANGELIST ST. MARK, ACCORDING TO WHICH THE WILL OF CHRIST COULD NOT BE FULFILLED: "ON ENTERING THE HOUSE, HE WANTED NO ONE TO KNOW IT, BUT HE COULD NOT REMAIN HIDDEN"! IF HE WANTED TO REMAIN HIDDEN WITHOUT SUCCESS, HIS WILL WAS FOUGHT AND ANNULLED? (pg. 201)

**QUESTION 26.** WE READ IN THE GOSPEL THAT THE ANGEL PREDICTED TO MARY, MOTHER OF THE LORD, THAT THE REIGN OF CHRIST WOULD "HAVE NO END." DANIEL MAKES THE SAME PREDICTION: "THEN WILL ARISE AN ETERNAL KINGDOM THAT WILL NEVER BE DESTROYED." ON THE CONTRARY, THE APOSTLE SPEAKING OF THE LORD SAYS: "WHEN HE HAS GIVEN HIS KINGDOM TO GOD HIS FATHER" (1 CORINTHIANS 15); HOW WILL HIS KINGDOM BE ETERNAL, SINCE HE MUST GIVE IT TO GOD HIS FATHER? (pg. 204)

**QUESTION 27.** THE SAVIOR SAYS, "IF ANYONE DOES NOT LEAVE ALL THAT HE HAS, THAT IS, HIS HOUSE, HIS FIELDS, AND THE REST, HE CANNOT BE MY DISCIPLE." NOW, EVANGELIST SAYS IN ANOTHER PLACE, "HERE IS A SENATOR NAMED JOSEPH, A RICH MAN, WHO WAS A DISCIPLE OF JESUS AND WAS WAITING FOR THE KINGDOM OF GOD, APPROACHED PILATE, ETC." (MARK 15, LUKE 23) HOW DOES THE EVANGELIST PRESENT AS A DISCIPLE THE ONE WHOM THE SAVIOR REJECTS? BESIDES, ZACCHAEUS WAS ALSO RICH, AS WELL AS CORNELIUS THE CENTURION, AND THE WOMEN WHO ASSISTED HIM WITH THEIR PROPERTY. (pg. 210)

**QUESTION 28.** IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS LASTED UNTIL JOHN, WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SEND AN OFFERING TO THE PRIESTS FOR HEALING? (pg. 179)

**QUESTION 29.** IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS LASTED UNTIL JOHN THE BAPTIST, FROM WHOM THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN WAS PREACHED, FOR IT WAS HE WHO INAUGURATED THIS NEW PREACHING, WHY DID HIS BAPTISM CEASE? (pg. 210)

**QUESTION 30.** WE READ IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN: "THE LAW WAS GIVEN BY MOSES, GRACE AND TRUTH BY JESUS CHRIST." IF THEREFORE GRACE AND TRUTH CAME THROUGH JESUS CHRIST, THEN IT DID NOT EXIST BEFORE, AND IF SO, HOW CAN IT BE SAID THAT GOD GAVE A LAW THAT DID NOT CONTAIN THE TRUTH? (pg. 227)

**QUESTION 31.** THE SABBATH IS CERTAINLY THE LAW OR PART OF THE LAW; HOW THEN IS THE LAW NOT DESTROYED BY THESE WORDS OF THE EVANGELIST: "NOT ONLY BECAUSE HE HAD BROKEN THE SABBATH, BUT ALSO BECAUSE HE SAID THAT GOD WAS HIS OWN FATHER?" (pg. 233)

**QUESTION 32.** IF WE LIVE WITH THE DISPOSITION OF OUR FREE WILL, WHY DID THE SAVIOR SAY, "NO ONE COMES TO ME UNLESS MY FATHER DRAWS HIM?" WHY DOES THE APOSTLE SPEAKING IN THE SAME SENSE EXPRESS HIMSELF IN THESE TERMS: "IT DOES NOT DEPEND ON THE ONE WHO WANTS, NOR ON THE ONE WHO RUNS, BUT ON GOD WHO HAS MERCY?" THESE WORDS SEEM TO CONSIDERABLY INFLUENCE THE FREE WILL OF THE WILL. IF NO ONE COMES WITHOUT BEING ATTRACTED, THERE IS NO MORE FAULT FOR HIM WHO DOES NOT COME, SINCE HE IS NOT DRAWN. AND IF IT IS NOT THE ONE WHO ASKS AND RUNS WHO RECEIVES, BUT GOD GIVES HIS GRACE TO WHOMEVER HE WANTS, MUST BE DISCHARGED FROM ALL SIN ONE WHO WANTS AND DOES NOT GET TO DROP THE WHOLE BLAME ON THE ONE WHO DESPISES THE PRAYERS ADDRESSED TO HIM. (pg. 235)

**QUESTION 33.** WHY DID THE LORD, WHO HAD HEALED ALMOST ALL THE SICK OF A SINGLE WORD, GIVE SIGHT TO THE BLIND MAN BY APPLYING MUD TO HIS EYES? (pg. 248)

**QUESTION 34.** WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "I AM THE DOOR," THOSE WHO CAME BEFORE ME ARE ROBBERS AND THIEVES, WORDS THAT SEEM TO ATTACK THE AUTHORITY OF THE PROPHETS? (pg. 248)

**QUESTION 35.** WHY DOES OUR LORD ON THE VERGE OF EXPLODING AN ASTONISHING AND UNKNOWN POWER UNTIL THEN, IN THE RESURRECTION OF LAZARUS, SHED TEARS AND ASK WHERE HE IS AS IF HE WAS IGNORANT? (pg. 249)

**QUESTION 36.** THE SAVIOR SAYS ON ONE SIDE: I PRAY FOR THOSE WHOM YOU HAVE GIVEN ME, I DO NOT PRAY FOR THE WORLD; THE EVANGELIST, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS: WE HAVE AN ADVOCATE NEAR THE FATHER WHO INTERCEDES FOR OUR SINS, AND NOT ONLY FOR OUR SINS, BUT FOR THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD. (1 JN. 2) THESE TWO TEXTS SEEM CONTRADICTORY. (pg. 265)

**QUESTION 37.** WHY DID THE SAVIOR SAY TO MARY WHEN SHE WANTED TO TOUCH HIM IN THE EXCESSES OF HIS JOY: "DO NOT TOUCH ME, FOR I HAVE NOT YET ASCENDED TO MY FATHER," WHILE WE READ THAT THE OTHER HOLY WOMEN TOUCHED HIM AND WORSHIPPED HIM? (pg. 266)

**QUESTION 38.** HOW TO EXPLAIN THE QUESTION OF MARY TO THE ANGEL: "HOW SHALL I KNOW WHAT YOU SAY TO ME, FOR I KNOW NO MAN? AND THE ANGEL GABRIEL ANSWERING SAID TO HIM, "THE HOLY GHOST WILL COME UPON YOU, AND THE VIRTUE OF THE MOST HIGH WILL OVERSHADOW YOU?" (pg. 205)

**QUESTION 39.** HOW COULD THE MAGI OF CHALDEA LEARN THE BIRTH OF CHRIST, KING OF THE JEWS, ON THE APPEARANCE OF A STAR THAT IS MORE COMMONLY THE SIGN THAT ANNOUNCES A KING OF THE EARTH? (pg. 161)

**QUESTION 40.** HOW TO RECONCILE THESE WORDS OF THE PROPHET ISAIAH SPEAKING OF CHRIST: "HE DID NOT COMMIT SIN," (ISAIAH 53:9) WITH THESE OTHERS OF THE APOSTLE: "HE WHO DID NOT KNOW SIN, HE WAS MADE SIN FOR US." (2 COR. 5:21) (pg. 282)

**QUESTION 41.** HE WHO IS NOT A SON OF GOD IS CERTAINLY OF THE DEVIL; HE IS THEREFORE ALWAYS THE SON SOMETIMES OF GOD, SOMETIMES OF THE DEVIL. WE MUST, THEREFORE, SERIOUSLY CONSIDER WHETHER WE ARE BORN OF GOD, OR OF THE DEVIL, OR WHETHER A THIRD SUPPOSITION CAN BE ADMITTED. (pg. 246)

**QUESTION 42.** DID THE APOSTLES HAVE THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE TIME THEY WERE WITH THE LORD, FOR THE EVANGELIST SAYS: "THE HOLY SPIRIT HAD NOT YET BEEN GIVEN, BECAUSE JESUS CHRIST WAS NOT YET GLORIFIED." AND IN ANOTHER PLACE: "IF YOU LOVE ME," SAID JESUS TO HIS DISCIPLES, "KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS. AND I WILL PRAY THE FATHER, AND HE WILL GIVE YOU ANOTHER COUNSELOR, TO BE WITH YOU FOREVER, EVEN THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, WHOM THE WORLD CANNOT RECEIVE, BECAUSE IT NEITHER SEES HIM NOR KNOWS HIM; YOU KNOW HIM, FOR HE DWELLS WITH YOU, AND WILL BE IN YOU." WHAT DO THESE WORDS MEAN? THE EVANGELIST DENIES THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT WAS GIVEN BEFORE PASSION, AND JESUS PROMISES TO PRAY TO HIS FATHER TO SEND HIM; AND ON THE OTHER HE ADDS THAT THIS SPIRIT WAS WITH THEM AND DWELT IN THEM. WE READ THAT AFTER HIS RESURRECTION HE BLEW ON THE APOSTLES AND SAID TO THEM, "RECEIVE THE HOLY SPIRIT." THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES TELL US AGAIN THAT HE CAME DOWN ON THE APOSTLES ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST. I SEE SO MANY CONTRADICTIONS IN THESE DIFFERENT ASSERTIONS THAT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT TO DO WITH THEM. (pg. 238)

**QUESTION 43.** WHAT REASONABLE ANSWER CAN ONE MAKE FROM THE LAW TO THE IMPIETY OF THE ARIANS? (pg. 261)

**QUESTION 44.** WE CONFESS THAT THE SAVIOR WAS BORN, HOW COULD THE APOSTLE SAY THAT HE WAS MADE FROM THE RACE OF DAVID (ROM. 1), THAT THERE IS A GREAT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BEING BORN AND MADE? (pg. 271)

**QUESTION 45.** IF JESUS CHRIST, OF THE RACE OF DAVID, BECAME THE SON OF GOD ACCORDING TO THE FLESH, THAT IS, IF IN HIS BIRTH HE WAS THE SON OF GOD IN HIS TWO NATURES BECAUSE HE WAS BORN HOLY, HOW CAN HE BE LORD GOD TOLD HIM AFTER HIS BAPTISM: "YOU ARE MY SON, I BEGOT YOU TODAY"? (HEBREWS 5:5; ACTS 13:33; PSALM 2:7) (pg. 167)

**QUESTION 46.** THE APOSTLE CALLS THE LAW GIVEN BY MOSES, A HOLY AND JUST LAW, A GOOD AND SPIRITUAL LAW (ROM. 7:12). ELSEWHERE HE SAID, THE LAW PROVOKES ANGER, AND WHERE THERE IS NO LAW, THERE IS NO TRANSGRESSION (ROM. 4:15). INDEED, THE ABSENCE OF LAW AND TRANSGRESSION IS A CAUSE OF SECURITY. (pg. 271)

**QUESTION 47.** WHY IS THE WISDOM OF THE FLESH AN ENEMY OF GOD, OR WHAT IS THIS WISDOM WHICH IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW OF GOD? (pg. 273)

**QUESTION 48.** THE APOSTLE SAYS OF THE PRINCES AND POWERS OF THIS WORLD THAT IF THEY HAD KNOWN THE LORD OF GLORY, THEY WOULD NEVER HAVE CRUCIFIED HIM. (1 COR. 2:8) THE EVANGELIST ST. MARK, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS OF THE DEMONS: "THEY KNEW IT WAS HIM." IF THE DEMONS KNEW HIM, HOW COULD THE POWERS IGNORE HIM?" (pg. 198)

**QUESTION 49.** WHAT IS THIS SPIRIT OF WHICH THE APOSTLE AFFIRMS AND DESIRES SALVATION WHEN HE SAYS: "I GAVE HIM UP TO SATAN FOR THE DEATH OF THE FLESH, THAT HIS SPIRIT MAY BE SAVED, ETC."? (pg. 274)

**QUESTION 50.** THERE IS A GREAT NUMBER OF SINS WHOSE BODY IS THE OBJECT, FOR EVERY MAN WHO COMMITS AN ACT OF VIOLENCE ON ANY PART OF HIS BODY, SIN AGAINST HIS BODY. THUS THIS ONE MUTILATES HIMSELF, THAT ONE HANGS HIMSELF, THIS OTHER PLUNGES A DAGGER INTO THE BREAST. WHY THEN DOES THE APOSTLE SAY, "EVERY SIN THAT MAN COMMITS IS OUTSIDE HIS BODY, BUT HE WHO GIVES HIMSELF UP TO FORNICATION SINS AGAINST HIS BODY?" (pg. 276)

**QUESTION 51.** WHY DOES THE APOSTLE SAY THAT HE HAS BECOME ALL THINGS TO EVERYONE, WHICH SEEMS TO BE THE FAULT OF A FANATIC AND A HYPOCRITE? (pg. 278)

**QUESTION 52.** WHAT DO THESE WORDS OF THE APOSTLE MEAN: "THAT ONLY TEMPTATIONS OF HUMANITY COME TO YOU?" DOES NOT HE SEEM TO DESIRE THIS TEMPTATION FOR THEM? AND WHAT ARE THESE HUMAN TEMPTATIONS? SO THERE ARE ALSO DIVINE TEMPTATIONS. THEREFORE, THEY MUST BE DISCERNED, AND HE MAKES THE DIFFERENCE HERE. (pg. 280)

**QUESTION 53.** WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THESE WORDS OF THE APOSTLE: "NO ONE CAN SAY JESUS IS THE LORD, EXCEPT BY THE HOLY SPIRIT?" SO PHOTIN, WHO DENIES THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST, CAN CONFESS IN THE HOLY SPIRIT THAT JESUS IS THE LORD; MARCIAN AND MANICHEA, WHO DENY THE INCARNATION OF CHRIST, WILL ALSO BE ABLE TO SAY THAT JESUS CHRIST IS THE LORD, AND SO ARE WOMEN OF BAD LIFE AND FILTHINESS, WHEREAS THE HOLY SPIRIT DOES NOT DWELL IN A SUBMISSIVE BODY TO SIN, AND THAT WISDOM DOES NOT ENTER A SOUL THAT WANTS EVIL. (WIS. 1:4) (pg. 281)

**QUESTION 54.** THE APOSTLE TEACHES THAT JESUS CHRIST DIED FOR ALL MEN. "ALL ARE THEREFORE DEAD," SAID HE, "AND HE DIED FOR ALL." THE SAVIOR SAYS, ON THE CONTRARY: THE SON OF MAN HAS COME TO GIVE HIS LIFE FOR THE REDEMPTION OF MANY. (MATT 20:28) THERE IS HERE A CONTRADICTION. (pg. 282)

**QUESTION 55.** WHY DOES THE APOSTLE ST. PAUL TAKE UP PETER HIS COLLEAGUE IN THE APOSTOLATE THAT, OUT OF FEAR OF THE CIRCUMCISED JEWS, HE WAS SEPARATING FROM THE GENTILES, WHILE HE HIMSELF, OUT OF FEAR ALSO OF THOSE WHO WERE CIRCUMCISED, THOUGHT HE OUGHT TO CIRCUMCISE TIMOTHY, AGAINST THE DEFENSE HE HIMSELF MADE TO RECEIVE CIRCUMCISION? HE IS THEREFORE REPREHENSIBLE. (ACTS 16:3) (pg. 287)

**QUESTION 56.** THE APOSTLE SAYS, "WE ARE JEWS BY OUR BIRTH." ACCORDING TO HIM, JEWS ARE BORN OF JEWS? BUT THOSE BORN IN THE DESERT WERE NOT CIRCUMCISED JEWS. IT IS NOT CIRCUMCISION THAT MAKES THE JEW, BUT THE BIRTH THAT TAKES PLACE UNDER THE RELIGION OF A CREATOR GOD. IF, THEREFORE, JEWS ARE BORN OF JEWS, AND PAGANS OF PAGANS, CHRISTIANS MUST ALSO BE BORN CHRISTIANS. (pg. 288)

**QUESTION 57.** WHY WAS IT NECESSARY FOR THE APOSTLE, IN THE REPROACHES HE ADDRESSES TO THE GALATIANS, TO INSERT THE REFLECTION THAT FOLLOWS? THE GALATIANS, AFTER HAVING EMBRACED THE GOSPEL, HAVING RETURNED AGAIN TO THE OBSERVANCES OF THE LAW, THE APOSTLE SAYS TO THEM, "A MEDIATOR IS NOT JUST FOR ONE PERSON ALONE, BUT GOD IS ONE," AS IF THE GALATIANS DENIED THE EXISTENCE OF A SINGLE GOD, THEY HAD INDEED BEEN BROUGHT BACK TO THE LAW IN THE NAME OF THIS DOCTRINE WHICH MADE THEM BELIEVE IN THE EXISTENCE OF ONE AND ONLY GOD, AND LOOK UPON CHRIST AS A PREDESTINATED MINISTER OF GOD TO DISTRIBUTE TO MEN THE GIFT OF GOD'S GRACE. (pg. 292)

**QUESTION 58.** IF JESUS IS FOR US THE AUTHOR OF SALVATION AND THE TRUE AND PERFECT KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, WHY DID HE NOT COME BEFORE, SO THAT THOSE WHO HAVE LIVED BEFORE US IN IGNORANCE MAY KNOW THE TRUTH? SINCE THE ADVENT OF JESUS CHRIST, MEN HAVE BEEN SAVED IN FAR GREATER NUMBERS THAN

BEFORE; IF HE HAD COME EARLIER, HE WOULD HAVE ADDED TO THE NUMBER OF THE ELECT. SO THERE IS SOMETHING HERE THAT LEAVES SOMETHING TO BE DESIRED. (pg. 349)

**QUESTION 59.** NO DOUBT THE PAGANS WERE ENSLAVED TO THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD. WHAT, THEN, ARE THESE WORDS OF THE APOSTLE: "WE WERE OURSELVES UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD." IF THE JEWS WERE THEMSELVES UNDER THE ELEMENTS, HOW WERE THE PAGANS DIFFERENT? (pg. 294)

**QUESTION 60.** THE APOSTLE TELLS THE GALATIANS THAT HE REPROVES AND CONDEMNS IN ALL THIS EPISTLE: "BE LIKE ME, SINCE I AM LIKE YOU." IF HE SHOWED HIMSELF AS THEY WERE, IT WAS USELESS TO SAY TO THEM: BE LIKE ME. PERHAPS HE HAD IMITATED THEM IN SOMETHING, AND THAT HE WANTED THEM TO BE SIMILAR IN OTHER RESPECTS? (pg. 296)

**QUESTION 61.** HOW DO WE HAVE THE USE OF OUR FREE WILL AND OF OUR CHOICE, SINCE THE APOSTLE SAYS: "THE FLESH HAS DESIRES CONTRARY TO THOSE OF THE SPIRIT, AND THE SPIRIT IS CONTRARY TO THOSE OF THE FLESH, AND THEY ARE OPPOSED TO ONE ANOTHER, SO THAT YOU DO NOT DO ALL THE THINGS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE?" IF THE FLESH HAS DESIRES CONTRARY TO THOSE OF THE SPIRIT, THEN IT IS BAD, BECAUSE THE SPIRIT ONLY SUGGEST GOOD THINGS. (pg. 297)

**QUESTION 62.** IF "ALL THE TREASURES OF KNOWLEDGE AND WISDOM ARE HIDDEN IN JESUS CHRIST," HOW CAN THE SAME SAVIOR SAY THAT HE KNOWS NEITHER THE DAY NOR THE HOUR OF THE FUTURE JUDGMENT? (MARK 13:32) IF HE KNOWS IT AND SAYS HE DOES NOT KNOW IT, IS IT NOT A LIE? (pg. 300)

**QUESTION 63.** HOW IS IT THAT THE APOSTLES, AFTER HAVING HEALED ALL THE SICK WHO WERE PRESENTED TO THEM, HAVE NOT CURED THE DISEASES OF THEIR OWN DISCIPLES? FOR, AFTER ALL, EPAPHRODITUS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SICK UNTO DEATH IF THE

PRAYERS OF THE APOSTLE HAD BEEN ANSWERED. WHO CAN DOUBT, INDEED, THAT THE APOSTLE HAS OFTEN ASKED GOD FOR HIS CURE WITHOUT BEING ABLE TO OBTAIN IT? FOR IF GOD HAD ANSWERED IT, THIS AILMENT WOULD HAVE DISAPPEARED AT ONCE. (pg. 302)

**QUESTION 64.** THE APOSTLE ST. PETER SAYS, "CHRIST DIED FOR YOU." ST. PAUL, ON THE CONTRARY, CLAIMS THAT HE DIED FOR HIM. "HE IS," SAID HE, "RENDERED OBEDIENT TILL DEATH; WHEREFORE GOD HAS GIVEN HIM A NAME WHICH IS ABOVE EVERY NAME." (PHILIP. 2:8-9) NOW IF THIS IS SO, SHOULD WE NOT CONCLUDE THAT IT WAS IMPERFECT, SINCE HE OWES TO HIS WORKS AN INCREASE OF GLORY? (pg. 304)

**QUESTION 65.** WHAT DO THESE WORDS SAY TO ST. JOHN IN REVELATION: GO, "TAKE THE BOOK AND DEVOUR IT, AND IT WILL BE BITTER IN YOUR BOWELS, BUT IN YOUR MOUTH IT WILL BE SWEET AS HONEY." WHAT IS THIS BOOK, OR IS IT SWEET, HOW CAN IT BE BITTER IN THE BOWELS? (pg. 305)

## 2<sup>ND</sup> CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT

(PL 35 2412-16)

1-12

**QUESTION 1.** HOW CAN WE UNDERSTAND THAT GOD CREATED MAN IN HIS IMAGE AND LIKENESS, AND CAN WE SAY THAT WOMAN IS THE IMAGE OF GOD? (pg. 26)

**QUESTION 2.** THE GOSPEL DECLARES THAT NO ONE HAS SEEN GOD (JN. 5:46, 1 TIM. 6:16, JN. 1:18); WHILE JACOB, MOSES, AND ISAIAH

CLAIM TO HAVE SEEN HIM. IT MAY BE SAID: NO ONE HAS SEEN THE FATHER; WHAT CAN THIS DO? IF WE HAVE SEEN THE SON, WE HAVE SEEN THE FATHER, SINCE THE FATHER AND THE SON ARE ONE GOD IN THEIR NATURE, IN THEIR IMAGE, FOR BOTH HAVE ONLY ONE IMAGE, AND AS THE SAVIOR SAYS: THE ONE WHO SEES ME ALSO SEES MY FATHER. (JN. 14:9) HOW IS IT THEN THAT NO ONE HAS SEEN GOD THE FATHER, SINCE THE SON TESTIFIES THAT WE SEE THE FATHER WHEN WE SEE HIM, BECAUSE THERE IS NO OTHER GOD. IF, THEN, THERE IS NONE ELSE, IT IS HIMSELF WHOM WE HAVE SEEN AS GOD, SINCE THERE IS ONLY ONE. (pg. 234)

**QUESTION 3.** THE ANCIENT LAW SHOWS US GOD MAKING OATHS (GEN. 22:16, EXOD. 33:1), FOR HE SAYS, "I HAVE SWORN BY MYSELF," SAYS THE LORD. THE SAVIOR, ON THE CONTRARY, FORBIDS TO MAKE OATHS, HAS HE NOT DESTROYED THE OLD LAW BY DESTROYING IT? (pg. 82)

**QUESTION 4.** WHY DID THE SAVIOR, ATTACHED TO THE CROSS, SAY, "FATHER, FORGIVE THEM, FOR THEY KNOW NOT WHAT THEY DO. IF THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING, WHAT NEED TO FORGIVE THEM, ESPECIALLY WHEN ABIMELECH SAYS TO GOD, "WILL YOU LOSE THOSE WHO HAVE SINNED THROUGH IGNORANCE? (pg. 218)

**QUESTION 5.** IF NO ONE IS JUSTIFIED BY THE LAW BEFORE GOD, WHY IS IT WRITTEN: CURSED HE WHO WILL NOT REMAIN FAITHFUL TO ALL THE PRESCRIPTIONS OF THE LAW, TO PUT THEM INTO PRACTICE? (DEUT. 27:26) IF MEN ARE JUSTIFIED BY FAITH AND NOT BY LAW, WHY THIS CURSE ON HIM WHO HAS NOT FULFILLED THE LAW, SINCE IT IS USELESS FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS? (pg. 291)

**QUESTION 6.** WHY DOES DAVID SAY IN ONE OF HIS PSALMS, "LET THESE BE CONFOUNDED AND ASHAMED, SAYING TO ME, 'VERY GOOD, VERY GOOD,'" WHILE THE SAVIOR SAYS, "ALL RIGHT." GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT, ETC. WHAT DAVID REGARDS AS AN

INSULT, OUR LORD APPLIES TO HIM WHOM HIS MERITS HAVE MADE WORTHY OF REWARD. (pg. 130)

**QUESTION 7.** WHY IS IT SAID IN THE PSALMS, "YOU WILL SAVE MEN AND ANIMALS," AND IN THE PROPHET JONAH, "I WILL NOT SPARE A CITY WHERE A HUNDRED AND THIRTY THOUSAND MEN AND A MULTITUDE DWELL. OF ANIMALS? "(JON. 4:11) WHILE THE APOSTLE SAYS, "DOES GOD CARE FOR OXEN? "(1 COR. 9:9) (pg. 129)

**QUESTION 8.** IT IS WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF TOBIT, "IT IS HONORABLE TO REVEAL AND TO CONFESS THE WORKS OF GOD;" WHILE THE SAVIOR, AFTER DOING THE WORK OF GOD, RECOMMENDS NOT TO TELL IT TO ANYONE. (pg. 114)

**QUESTION 9.** ON THE ETERNITY OF THE SON. (pg. 400)

**QUESTION 10.** WHY DOES SAINT PAUL SAY TO THE GALATIANS: I AM ASTONISHED THAT YOU WOULD SOON LEAVE THE ONE WHO CALLED YOU TO THE GRACE OF JESUS CHRIST TO PASS TO ANOTHER GOSPEL, ALTHOUGH THERE IS NO OTHER GOSPEL? IF IT IS ANOTHER, IT IS NOT THE SAME; IF HE IS NOT THE SAME, HOW IS HE NOT ANOTHER? (pg. 298)

**QUESTION 11.** THE APOSTLE ST. PAUL URGES US NOT TO GRIEVE ABOUT THE DEAD, WHICH IS PROPER TO THOSE WHO HAVE NO HOPE; AND HE HIMSELF SAYS TO US ELSEWHERE, WHEN HE SPEAKS OF EPAPHRODITUS: "HE HAS BEEN SICK UNTO DEATH, BUT GOD HAS PITY ON HIM; AND NOT ONLY OF HIM, BUT ALSO OF ME, SO THAT I DID NOT HAVE AFFLICTION ON AFFLICTION." WHY DOES HE FORBID CHRISTIANS TO BE SAD, SINCE HE DECLARES THAT THE DEATH OF EPAPHRODITUS HIMSELF WOULD HAVE THROWN HIM INTO GREAT SADNESS? (pg. 303)

**QUESTION 12.** WHY DO YOU SAY THAT RACHEL CRIES FOR HER CHILDREN WHEN THE CHILDREN OF LIA AND THE TRIBE OF JUDA ARE PUT TO DEATH? (pg. 163)

# ELENCHUS QUÆSTIONUM

## EX MANUSCRIPTIS CODICIBUS

PRIMI GENERIS.

### QUÆSTIONES VETERIS TESTAMENTI (!).

- I. Quid est Deus.  
II. Cur Deus mundum fecerit.  
III. Quid opus erat per Moysen, et non ante, exordium mundi et ordinem creature expondere.  
IV. Quare Legem non in primordio dedit.  
V. Ut quid Abel sacrificium acceptatum est, et Cain refutatum.  
VI. Si Lamech occidit Cain, sicut putatur.  
VII. Que decem verba in tabulis data sunt, etc.  
VIII. Ut quid Moyses descendens de monte vultum splendidum habuit.  
IX. Si omnia Deus bona facit, quid est ut dicat ad Noe de mundis et immundis : Induc tecum, etc.  
X. Cum Deus dicat, quod quartu progenie exituri essent filii Israel de Ægypto, cur Moyses quinta, inquit, progenie exierunt.  
XI. Si viri justi voluntas bona est, quare Isaac non Esau quem voluit, sed Jacob benedixit quem noluit.  
XII. Quare Abraham fidei sue signum circumcisionem accepit.  
XIII. Si iudicium Dei justum est, quare infantes in Sodomia cremati sunt.  
XIV. Quid est ut Deus, qui justus prædicatur, peccata patrum filiis dicat reddi.  
XV. Cum justum prædictet Lex, contra Salomon : Noli, ait, esse justus multum.  
XVI. Quare Angelus, qui volebat in via Moysen occidere, circumcisione infantis placatus est.  
XVII. Quid est ut maledictos dicat, qui non reliquerint semen in Israel.  
XVIII. Quare Saul peccans petit orari pro se, et impetrare non potuit : David autem e contra.  
XIX. Si Adam corpus immortale habuit, an mortale.  
XX. Quid est quod dicitur : Panem Angelorum manducavit homo : cum Angeli non egeant cibo.  
XXI. Quid sit ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei fecisse hominem, et an mulier imago Dei.  
XXII. Quid est ut dicat Salomon : Justifica animam tuam ante obitum tuum, etc.  
XXIII. An ex traduce sint animæ, sicut corpora.  
XXIV. Quid est ut vir imago Dei sit, et non mulier.  
XXV. Ut quid Joseph adjurat filios Israel, ut tollerent cineres ejus de Ægypto.  
XXVI. De Eliæ, an id quod dure petuit ab Eliä, consuetus sit.  
XXVII. An pythonissa Samuel excitaverit.  
XXVIII. Quid contradicendum his sit, qui mundum aeternum dicunt.  
XXIX. Quare octavo die circumcidì mandatum est.  
XXX. In Proverbii ait : Justus sui accusator est : quomodo justus, si peccator.  
XXXI. An cum muliere serpens natura locutus sit, an ab actu dictus serpens an diabolus.  
XXXII. Legimus apud Salomonem : Dives et pauper obviaverunt sibi, fecit autem ambos Deus. Quomodo ergo non est personarum acceptio apud Deum.  
XXXIII. Salomon : Anni, inquit, impiorum minuentur : cum videamus impios aliquantos longævos.  
XXXIV. Apud Salomonem, Deus mortem non facit : et alio loco : Bona et mala, vita et mors a Deo sunt.  
XXXV. Qua ratione David Saul, postquam Deus ab eo recessit, Christum Domini vocat, etc.  
XXXVI. Si anima que peccat ipsa morietur, quid est ut in causa Charmi tringita viri occisi sunt.  
XXXVII. Quid est ut missa mors in Jacob venerit in Israel.  
XXXVIII. Si equus et mulus non habent intellectum, quanto magis terra ? quid ergo est ut dicatur terra benedicere Dominum.  
XXXIX. Quid est quod legitur in Salomone : Spes est in tenebris. Melior est canis vivus leone mortuo.  
XL. Quid est quod dicit Propheta : Lætare sterilis, quæ non paris, etc.  
XLI. An Spiritus qui super aquas ferebatur, Spiritus sanctus intelligatur.

- XLI. Car Angelus Moysi et in igne et in rubo apparuit.  
 XLIII. Cum Abraham prohibitus sit filium suum immolare, cur Iephate filiam immolare non prohibetur.  
 XLIV. Adversum Judeos.  
 XLV. Quomodo homo ad imaginem Dei factus sit, et an mulier quoque.  
 XLVI. Utrum Samuel fuerit de filiis Aaron, et utrum sacerdos.  
 XLVII. De hoc quod in Isaia legitur : Et apprehendent septem mulieres.

#### QUÆSTIONES NOVI TESTAMENTI.

- XLVIII. Deus perfectio est : quid ergo opus fuit Christo ut nasceretur.  
 XLIX. Cur Salvator baptizatus sit.  
 L. Si ideo Salvator baptizatus est ut exemplo esset, quare non ita et in circumcisione.  
 LI. Quomodo intelligatur : Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te.  
 LII. Si de Spiritu sancto natus est Christus, cur dictum est : Sapientia edificavit sibi dominum.  
 LIII. Quid est ut VIII Kalend. Januar. Salvator natus dicatur.  
 LIV. Si ex semine David Christus Filius Dei factus, id est jam natus est, quare cum baptizatur audit, Filius meus es tu : Ego hodie genui te.  
 LV. Quid causa fuit ut VII Kal. April. crucifigi se permitteret Dominus.  
 LVI. Quare in Matthæo pater Joseph Jacob scribitur, et in Luca, Heli, etc.  
 LVII. Quid est ut cum in Malachia scriptum sit : Ecce ego mitto Angelum meum, Marcus dicat in Isaia, etc.  
 LVIII. Qua ratione negat Joannes Christum se nosse ante baptismum, cum probet ante eum nosse.  
 LIX. Si baptismus celeste mysterium est, cur Nicodemo ait Dominus : Si terrestria dixi vobis, etc.  
 LX. Si Lex et Prophetæ usque ad Joannem, quare Salvator ad Sacerdotes mittit offerri inuerna.  
 LXI. Quid est ut Iudeis discipulos, accusantibus Dominus David exemplum preferret, per quod videntur simul cum David rei fieri.  
 LXII. Quid est ut occisis filiis Lize, Rachel filios suos plangere dicatur.  
 LXIII. Qua ratione Magi per stellam Christum Regem Judæorum natum intellexerunt.  
 LXIV. Quomodo probatur, post tres dies et noctes surrexisse Salvatorem.  
 LXV. Si uno ore Evangelistæ locuti sunt, cur tres sexa hora, et Marcus tertius dixerit passum Dominum.  
 LXVI. Marcus dæmonia dixit cognovisse Dominum, A ostolus vero : Si intellexissent, ait, etc.  
 LXVII. Quid est ut in cruce Dominus dicat : Pater ignoscere illis : non enim sciunt, etc. Si enim nesciunt, quid ignoriscentur.  
 LXVIII. Orandum pro inimicis docemur, quare animæ occisorum vindicari se petant.  
 LXIX. Si prædicante Joanne Lex cessavit, quomodo Salvator : Non veni, ait, solvere Legem, sed adimplere.  
 LXX. Dominus certe inimicos nos esse vult diabolo, quare ergo : Esto, inquit, consentiens adversario.  
 XXI. Jacob appellatus est homo videns Deum; quomodo Deum nemo vidit unquam.  
 LXXII. Quid est quod dicitur in Apocalypsi : Vade et accipe librum, et devora illum, etc.  
 LXXIII. Quid est quod dicit Simeon ad Mariam matrem Domini : Positus est hic in ruinaam, etc.  
 LXXIV. Quid sibi vult ut Isaías dicat de Christo : Qui peccatum non fecit : et Apostolus : Pro nobis peccatum fecit.
- LXXV. Car Salvator pro se tantum et pro Petro dirachma solvit.  
 LXXVI. In Evangelio Lex, per Moysem data est; gratia et veritas per Christum. An antea veritas non erat. Ergo nec Lex.  
 LXXVII. Quid est quod dicitur in Marco : Intrans in domum neminem voluit scire, et non potuit latere.  
 LXXVIII. Legitur in Joanne quod cum negaret se Jesus ascendisse ad diem festum, ascendit tamen.  
 LXXIX. Si proprio arbitrio vivimus, quare Salvator dixit : Nemo venit ad me nisi Pater atraxerit eum.  
 LXXX. Certe aut Filius Dei quisque est aut diaboli, quid ergo nascimur requirendum est.  
 LXXXI. Apostolus ait : Nos natura Iudei : de Iudeis ergo nasci Iudeos ostendit, non de proselytis, etc.  
 LXXXII. Pagani elementis subjecti sunt, quare ergo dicit Apostolus : Eramus sub elementis, etc.  
 LXXXIII. Si per Christum salus et vera cognitio, car non ante venit, etc.  
 LXXXIV. Quare Lunæ cursum in ratione Paschæ custodientes, reprehendimus Paganos, quia dies lunares et motum custodiunt.  
 LXXXV. Quid est ut cum a David usque ad transmigrationem Babylonis septem decim sint generationes; Evangelista dicit quatuor decim.  
 LXXXVI. Quid est quod probet matrem Domini esse de tribu David.  
 LXXXVII. Si uuuus est Deus, cur in tribus spes salutis est.  
 LXXXVIII. Si major gratia in Novo est Testamento, cur in veteri sedes videntur Dominus et stans in nore.  
 LXXXIX. Quomodo accipiendum quod Salvator dicit de Spiritu sancto, quod veniens arguet mundum, etc.  
 XC. Si satanas diabolus est, quare dicit Iudeis : De patre diabolo nati estis, etc.  
 XCI. Adversus Photinum qui dicit Christum ante Mariam non esse.  
 XCII. Quomodo intelligatur quod dicit Dominus : Pacem meam do vobis, etc.  
 XCIII. An Apostoli Spiritum sanctum habuerunt presente Domino in carne.  
 XCIV. Si Judas Scariothes ante Passionem Domini crepuit pendens.  
 XCV. Unde orta sit observatio Pentecostes.  
 XCVI. Si pascha transitus interpretetur.  
 XCVII. Adversus Arium.  
 XCVIII. Si satanas diabolus est, quare Salvator dicit Iudeis : De patre diabolo estis.  
 XCIX. Quid ait : Tentatio vos non apprehendat nisi humana.  
 CI. De eo quod legitur in Evangelio Matthæi : Confiteor tibi Pater, etc.  
 CI. De jactantia Romanorum Levitarum.  
 CII. Contra Novatianos, qui parententiam salutarem negant.  
 CIII. Cum constet Deum in Levitico de sacrificiis offerendis mandasse, cur alibi negat et respuit.  
 CIV. Ut quid Dominus gladium parari jussit, et post prohibuit percutere.  
 CV. Quomodo Prophæta quadret cum Evangelio de obscuratione solis, etc.  
 CVI. Quomodo intelligenda sunt quæ leguntur in Genesi de opere sex dierum.  
 CVII. De ordine diei et noctis, ultra sit prior.  
 CVIII. De lingua hebraica, unde nomen accepit.  
 CIX. De Melchisedech, quomodo Abrahamo bene-dixerit, etc.

- CX. *De Psalmo primo.*  
 CXI. *De Psalmo vigesimo tertio.*  
 CXII. *De Psalmo quinquagesimo.*  
 CXIII. *Cur Filius Dei missus sit, et non aliis.*  
 CLIV. *Adversus paganos.*  
 CXV. *De fato.*  
 CXVI. *De Paschate unde dictum sit, et quomodo mystice celebretur per sanguinem.*  
 CXVII. *De Abraham et ejus fide.*  
 CXVIII. *De Job.*  
 CXIX. *De Tobia.*  
 CXX. *De jejunio.*

- CXXI. *De Paschate, quam laudabilis et gloria sit solemnitas.*  
 CXXII. *De eo quod legitur apud Evangelium: In principio erat Verbum.*  
 CXXIII. *Utrum Adam Spiritum sanctum habuerit.*  
 CXXIV. *Quomodo idem opus differt secundum personas sive in laudem sive in condemnationem.*  
 CXXV. *Contra Eusebium, utrum Spiritus sanctus sanctus scivit mysterium nativitatis Dominicae.*  
 CXXVI. *De eo qui fidem percepit, quid plus habeat ad gratiam consequendam.*  
 CXXVII. *De Adam et Eva.*

## EX MANUSCRIPTIS CODICIBUS

SECUNDI GENERIS.

### CAPITULA DE VETERI TESTAMENTO (!).

1. *De Deo et de hominis libero arbitrio.*
2. *Adversum eos qui negant ad Deum aliquid pertinere.*
3. *Cur Deus mundum fecerit.*
4. *Quid opus erat per Moysen postea et non ante, exordium mundi et ordinem creaturae expondere.*
5. *Quare Legem non in primordio dedit.*
6. *Ut quid Abel sacrificium acceptatum est, Cain repudiatum.*
7. *Si Lamech occidit Cain, sicut putatur.*
8. *Quarum decem verba in tabulis data sunt.*
9. *Ut quid Moyses descendens de monte, etc.*
10. *Si omnia Deus bona fecit, quid est, etc.*
11. *Cum Deus dicat ad Abraham de filiis Israel, quod quarum progenie exituri essent, etc.*
12. *Si viri justi voluntas bona est, quid est ut Esau, etc.*
13. *Qua ratione David Saul, postquam Deus ab eo recessit, Christum Domini vocat.*
14. *Quare Abraham fidei sua signum, etc.*
15. *Si iudicium Dei justum est, quare infantes in Sodomia, etc.*
16. *Quid est ut Deus qui justus praedicatur, etc.*
17. *Cum justum prædicet Lex, contra Salomon, etc.*
18. *Quare Angelus qui in via volebat occidere Moysem, etc.*
19. *Quid est ut maledictus dicat qui, etc.*
20. *Quare Saul peccava petit orari pro se, etc.*
21. *Si Adam corpus immortale habuit, etc.*
22. *Quid est quod dicitur: Panem, etc.*
23. *Quid sit ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei, etc.*
24. *Quid est ut dicat Salomon: Justifica, etc.*
25. *An ex traduce sint animae.*
26. *Quid est ut vir imago Dei sit, etc.*
27. *Ut quid Joseph adjurat filios Israël, etc.*
28. *De Elismo, an id quod dure petiti, etc.*
29. *An pythones Samuel excitaverit.*
30. *Quid contradicendum his qui mundum aeternum dicunt.*
31. *Quare octavo die circumcididi mandatum est.*
32. *In Proverbii ait: Justus sui accusator est, etc.*
33. *An cum muliere natura serpens locutus sit, etc.*
34. *Legimus apud Salomon: Dives et pauper, etc.*
35. *Salomon: Anni, inquit, impiorum minuentur, etc.*
36. *Apud Salomonem: Deus mortem non fecit, etc.*
37. *Cur Deus dixit: Non permanebit spiritus meus in hominibus istis, quia sunt caro; et erunt anni illorum centum viginti.*

38. *Quid contineat benedictio Jacob, quam dedit.*
39. *Cur Angelus Moysi et in igne et in rubo apparuit.*
40. *Non fuit aliud signum, quod feret a Moyse palam Pharaoni, nisi serpens.*
41. *Quid est quod in Psalmo: Homines, inquit, et jumenta salvos facies. Et ad Jonam: Non parcam, ait, civitati, in qua habitant centum viginti millia hominum et pecora multa, etc.*
42. *Si Adam factus a Deo et animalius Spiritum sanctum accepit (2).*
43. *Si anima que peccat ipsa morietur, quid est ut in causa Charmi triginta sex viri occisi sunt.*
44. *Quid est ut missa mors in Jacob, venerit in Israel.*
45. *In sole, inquit, posuit tabernaculum suum, id est corpus suum in quo habitat Christus, qui a Pilato flagellis catus est: quomodo ergo dicitur in Psal. de Christo: Flagellum non appropinquabit tabernaculo tuo.*
46. *Cur Adam in mundo positus mandatum accepit.*
47. *Vetus Lex Deum jurasse allegat: Salvator autem jurare prohibuit: quomodo non destruxit vetera.*
48. *Cur in Lege etiam ipsi Aaron dictum est ut pro peccatis suis holocausta offerret, cum dicat David: Pro delictis holocaustum non postulasti, etc.*
49. *Cur Salomon Spiritum sapientiae habuit, cum vitam mundanam non haberet.*
50. *In Tobia: Opera Dei revelare et confiteri honorificum est: Salvator autem opus Dei factiens: Nulli ait, dixeris.*
51. *Ut quid circumcisio et præcepta data sunt populo, quia prius non erant, neque nunc in auctoritate habentur.*
52. *Quid est ut dicatur terra benedicere Dominum, etc.*
53. *Quid est quod legitur in Salomon: Spes est in tenebris, etc.*
54. *In Sapientia: Qui creavit, inquit, orbem ex materia invisa. Et contra, quia ex nihilo facti sumus.*
55. *Quid est quod dicit Prophetæ: Latire sterilis, quæ non parit, etc.*
56. *An spiritus, qui super aquas ferebatur, Spiritus sanctus intelligatur.*

### CAPITULA DE NOVO TESTAMENTO.

1. *Deus perfectio est: quid ergo opus fuit Christo ut nasceretur.*
2. *Si unus Deus est, cur in tribus spes salutis, et quare prius non est Trinitas predicata.*
3. *Cur facta et dicta Dominica quatuor libris, et a quatuor Evangelistis scripta.*
4. *Quis ordo quatuor Evangeliorum.*
5. *Quare Matthæus scribit: Liber generationis Iesu Christi Filii David; cum prior sit Abraham.*

6. *Quid est ut generationes in tres partes divideret*  
*Matthæus.*  
 7. *Quare cum XLI sint generationes, Evangelista XLII numerasse videtur.*  
 8. Quid est ut cum constet a David ad transmigrationem Babylonis XVIII esse generationes, Evangelista XIV dicat.  
 9. Cur Salvator baptizatus sit.  
 10. Si ideo Salvator baptizatus est ut exemplo esset, quare non ita et in circumcisione.  
 11. Si ex semine David Christus Filius Dei factus, id est jam natus est, quare cum baptizatur audit : Filius meus es tu : Ego hodie genui te.  
 12. Si de Spiritu sancto natus est Christus, cur dictum est : Sapientia edificavit sibi dominum.  
 13. Quomodo intelligatur, Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te.  
 14. Quid est ut VIII Kalend. Januar. Salvator natus dicitur.  
 15. Quid causæ fuit ut VIII April. crucifigi se permettret Dominus.  
 16. Quare in Matthæo pater Joseph Jacob scribitur, et in Luca Heli, etc.  
 17. *Ut quid Salvator XI diebus jejunavit et postea esurit.*  
 18. *Cur baptismus Joannis cessavit.*  
 19. *Quare Lex usque ad Joannem, cum Apostolus dicit Legi nos subiectos esse debere.*  
 20. Si prædicante Joanne Lex cessavit, quomodo Salvator : Non veni, ait, solvere Legem, etc.  
 21. Si Lex et propheta usque ad Joannem, quare Salvator ad sacerdotes mittit, etc.  
 22. *Quomodo non evacuata Lex est, quando sabbatum solutum est.*  
 23. *Cur Salvator discipulos suos filios tonitrui appellavit.*  
 24. Cur Nicodemo ait Dominus : Si terrena dixi vobis, etc.  
 25. Quid est ut Judæis discipulos accusantibus Dominus David exemplum proferret, etc.  
 26. Qua ratione Magi per stellam Christum regem Iudeorum natum intellexerunt.  
 27. Quid est ut occisis filiis Lîe, Rachel filios suos planegre diecatur.  
 28. *Cur post baptismum accessit ad Salvatorem tentator, dicens : Si Filius Dei est, etc.*  
 29. *Cur Salvator tentatori non aliter quam exemplis Legis restituit.*  
 30. Quid est ut cum in Malachia scriptum sit : Ecce ego mitto Angelum meum : Marcus dicat in Isaia.  
 31. Qua ratione negat Joannes Christum se nosse ante baptismum, cum probet ante eum nosse.  
 32. *Quomodo Deum nemo vidit unquam, cum Filius dical videri Patrem cum ipse videtur.*  
 33. *Cur Salvator mulieri alienigenæ, id est Chananeæ, initio misericordiam denegabat, non item Centurioni alienigenæ, etc.*  
 34. Quomodo probatur post tres dies et noctes resurrexisse Salvatorem.  
 35. *Cur tres Evangelistæ sexta hora, et Marcus tercia dixerit passum Dominum.*  
 36. Quid est ut in Grace Dominus dicat : Pater ignosce illis, etc.  
 37. Marcus dæmonia cognovisse dixit Dominum : Apostolus vero de principibus sæculi : Si cognovissent, ait, etc.  
 38. Grandum pro inimicis docemur : quare animæ occisorum vindicari se petant.  
 39. *Quid est : Propter quod donavit illi nomen, etc. cum imperfectus videatur, qui per opera sua augetur.*  
 40. In Evangelio, Lex, ait, per Moysen data est, gralia et veritas per Christum. An antea veritas non erat, etc.  
 41. Quid est quod legitur in Marco : Intrans in domum voluit neminem scire, et non potuit latere.  
 42. *Cur Joannes ad Dominum : Tu es qui venturus es, an alium expectamus.*  
 43. *Quid est ut Salvator alio verbo, cæcum autem facie luto de sputo curaret.*  
 44. *Quid est ut Lazarum resuscitatus fleret; aut locum ubi positus erat, quasi ignarus quereret.*  
 45. *Quid est, ut Herodem mortuum legamus; infra autem, et post multos annos Herodem Joannes occidisse.*  
 46. Quid est quod probet matrem Domini esse de tribu David.  
 47. Si arbitrio proprio vivimus, cur Salvator dixit : Nemo venit ad me nisi Pater altraxerit eum.  
 48. *Cur Apostolus omnibus omnia se factum dicit, quod factum videtur adulatori et hypocritæ.*  
 49. Quid est quod dicitur in Apocalypsi : Vade et accipe librum et devora, etc.  
 50. *Quid est ut Apostolus factum Salvatorem dicat ex semine David.*  
 51. *Quid est quod dicit Apostolus ad Galat. Estote sicut ego, quia ego sicut vos?*  
 52. *Quonodo liberi sumus arbitrii ac voluntatis, cum dicat Apostolus : Caro concupiscit adversus Spiritum, et Spiritus adversus carnem, ut non quæ rullis ea facias.*  
 53. *Qua ratione sapientia carnis inimica est Deo, etc.*  
 54. Quid est quod dicit Simeon ad Mariam matrem Domini : Positus est hic in ruinam, etc.  
 55. *Quid est quod Joannes dicit ad Christum : Tu es qui venturus es, an alium expectamus? an dubitans dixerit.*  
 56. Quid sibi vult ut Isaías dicat de Christo : Qui peccatum non fecit; et Apostolus : Qui pro nobis peccatum fecit.  
 57. *Quid est quod Apostolus dicit Galatis : Miror quod sic tam cito transferimini ab eo qui vocarit vos in gratiam in aliud Evangelium, quod non est aliud, etc.*  
 58. *Quare Apostolus dicit : Omne peccatum quod fecerit homo extra corpus est; qui autem fornicatur, in corpus suum peccat : cum peccare in corpus suum videantur, qui sibi vim inferunt.*  
 59. *Cur Salvator pro se tantum et pro Petro didrachma solvit.*  
 60. *Cur Apostolus Paulus reprehendat Petrum quod circumcisionem daret, cum et ipse Timotheum circumcidit.*  
 61. *Quem Spiritum Apostolus salvandum asserit cum dicit, tradi hujusmodi hominem satanæ in interitum carnis, ut Spiritus, etc.*  
 62. *Quare Salvator orat et ait : Ne fiat fuga vestra hyeme vel sabbato : cum tempus persecutionis hujus differri non possit.*  
 63. Certo aut Filius Dei quisque est, aut diaboli : quid ergo nascimur requirendum est.  
 64. Apostolus ait : Nos natura Judæi. De Judæis ergo nasci Judæos ostendit, non de proselytis, etc.  
 65. *Quid est quod Apostolus dicit : Nemo potest dicere Dominum Deum nisi in Spiritu sancto, cum Photinus Marcius, Manichæus, meretrices et spuriæ dicant.*  
 66. *Si in Lege nemo justificatur, ut quid maledictus est, qui non implavit Legem.*  
 67. *Si in Christo omnes thesauri sapientiae et scientiarum, quomodo de die et hora iudicii dicit se nescire.*  
 68. Pagani elementis subiecti sunt, quare ergo dicat Apostolus : Erasmus sub elementis, etc.  
 69. *Salvator ait : Qui non reliquerit omnia, etc. non*

- potest meus esse discipulus : cum ex Evangelio discipulus Iesu fuerit Joseph ab Arimathia homo dives, etc.*
70. *Quid est ut Salvator dicat Maria : Noli me tangere, etc. cum legatur ab aliis mulieribus tactus.*
71. *Quid est : Qui ante me fuerunt, fures sunt, etc. quod videatur Prophetas pulsare.*
72. *Apostolus dicit Christum pro omnibus mortuum esse : at ipse Dominus ait se dare animam suam redemtionem pro multis.*
73. *Quid est ut David : Euge, in malo accipit : Salvator in bono ponit.*
74. *Quid sit : Tentatio vos non apprehendat nisi humana.*
75. *Quomodo Lex sancta et justa et bona, si quidem iram operatur.*
76. *Si dura mandata propter diffidentiam acceperant Iudei, quid est ut eorum posteri tisdem astringerentur.*
77. *Salvator dicit : Non pro mundo rogo : quid ergo Joannes ait, eum advocatum esse pro universo mundo.*
78. *Quomodo regni Christi non erit finis, cum Apostolus dicat : Cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri.*
79. *Si per Christum salus et vera cognitio, cur non ante venit, etc.*
80. *Cur Apostolus ad Galatas ait : Deus unus est : quasi unum Deum negarent.*
81. *Cum Salvator dixerit : Postquam resurrexero, præcedam vos in Galileam, ibi me videbitis : quid est ut inveniatur versus Jerusalem.*
82. *Quomodo Apostolus contristandum retat, cum ipse contristandum se si Epaphroditus obiisset, declarat.*
83. *Apostoli alios sibi oblatos sanarunt, quid est ut propriis infirmis medelant non dederint.*
84. *Unde origo Pentecostes.*
85. *Jacob appellatus est homo videns Deum : quomodo Deum nemo vidit unquam.*
86. *Quare lunæ cursum in ratione Paschæ custodientes, reprehendimus Paganos, quia lunares dies custodian.*
87. *Quid est quod Salvator dicit de Spiritu sancto, quod veniens arguet mundum, etc.*
88. *Si satanas diabolus est, quare dicit Judæis : De patre diabolo estis.*
89. *Quomodo intelligitur quod dicit Dominus : Pacem meam do vobis.*
90. *An Apostoli Spiritum sanctum habuerunt praesente Domino in carne.*
91. *Si Pascha transitus interpretetur.*
92. *De aeternitate Filii.*
93. *Adversus Photinum, etc.*
94. *Adversus Arium.*
95. *De Spiritu sancto (1).*







